arXiv:1604.05284v1 [math.PR] 18 Apr 2016

TAILS OF POLYNOMIALS OF RANDOM VARIABLES AND STABLE LIMITS FOR NONCONVENTIONAL SUMS

YURI KIFER AND S.R.S. VARADHAN

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY
JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

COURANT INSTITUTE
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, USA

Abstract. First, we obtain decay rates of probabilities of tails of polynomials in several independent random variables with heavy tails. Then we derive stable limit theorems for sums of the form $\sum_{Nt\ge n\ge 1} F\big(X_{q_1(n)},\dots,X_{q_\ell(n)}\big)$ where F is a polynomial, $q_i(n)$ is either $n-1+i$ or ni and $X_n, n\ge 0$ is a sequence of independent identically distributed random variables with heavy tails. Our results can be viewed as an extension to the heavy tails case of the nonconventional functional central limit theorem from [11].

1. Introduction

Nonconventional ergodic theorems (with the name coming from [8]) motivated originally by multiple recurrence problems have attracted much attention during the last 30 years. Probabilistic limit theorems for corresponding expressions have appeared more recently, in particular, a functional central limit theorem for nonconventional sums of the form

$$S_N(t)=\sum_{Nt\ge n\ge 1} F\big(X_{q_1(n)},\dots,X_{q_\ell(n)}\big) \tag{1.1}$$

was obtained in [11] for sequences of random variables $X_1, X_2, ...$ with weak dependence. In this paper we consider polynomial functions

$$F(x_1,...,x_\ell)=\sum_{\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_\ell} h_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_\ell}\, x_1^{\sigma_1}\cdots x_\ell^{\sigma_\ell}, \tag{1.2}$$

where the sum is taken over a finite set of nonnegative integer indexes, and study the tail probabilities of $F(X_1, X_2, ..., X_\ell)$ for independent random variables X_i, $i\ge 1$ with heavy tails. Then we obtain various results concerning convergence of distributions of properly normalized and centralized sums of the form (1.1) where for all i's either $q_i(n)=n-1+i$ or $q_i(n)=in$, F has the form (1.2) and X_i's are independent and have identical distributions with heavy tails.

Date: April 20, 2016.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60F17 Secondary: 60E07, 60G52.

Key words and phrases. stable distributions, heavy tails, limit theorems, Levi process, nonconventional sums.

Yu. Kifer was supported by ISF grant 82/10 and Einstein Foundation, Berlin grant A 2012 137, S.R.S. Varadhan was supported by NSF grant DMS 1208334.

We start with random variables X having the same asymptotical tail behavior as stable distributions, i.e.

$$\mathbf{P}\{\pm X > x\} \sim c^{\pm} x^{-\alpha} \text{ as } x \to \infty \tag{1.3}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 2$ and $c^{\pm} \geq 0$ with $c^{+} + c^{-} > 0$. Then we consider the minimal class which contains all such random variables and which is closed with respect to sums and products of independent random variables with such tails. It turns out that this class consists of random variables X with tails

$$P\{\pm X > x\} \sim c^{\pm} x^{-\alpha} (\ln x)^{k} \text{ as } x \to \infty \tag{1.4}$$

where $k \geq 0$ is an integer.

Namely, if we start with ℓ independent random variables $X_1, ..., X_\ell$ with tails of the form

$$P\{\pm X_i > x\} \sim c_i^{\pm} x^{-\alpha_i} (\ln x)^{k_i} \text{ as } x \to \infty, \tag{1.5}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 2$, $k_i \geq 0$ are some integers and $c^{\pm} \geq 0$, $c_i^{+} + c_i^{-} > 0$, then the polynomial $Y = F(X_1, ..., X_\ell)$, with F given by (1.2), will have the tail behavior

$$P\{\pm Y > x\} \sim c_*^{\pm} x^{-\alpha_*} (\ln x)^{k_*} \text{ as } x \to \infty \tag{1.6}$$

where $c_*^{+} + c_*^{-} > 0$, $0 < \alpha_* < 2$ and both α_* and an integer $k_* \geq 0$ can be explicitly described. Actually, this holds true for a somewhat larger class of random variables X_i having tail distributions satisfying (1.5) with any real $k_i \geq 0$, and so we obtain our results for the latter. Allowing negative integer values for k will generate tail behavior that contains additional $\ln \ln x$ terms. In fact, our method works directly also for F given by a finite sum (1.2) with arbitrary real nonnegative $\sigma_1, ..., \sigma_\ell$ provided random variables X_i's are nonnegative to make sense of their arbitrary real powers.

Next, we consider nonconventional sums (1.1) where F is a polynomial of the form (1.2), $\{X_i,\, i \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with the tail behavior given by (1.4). Concerning integer valued functions $1 \leq q_1(n) < q_2(n) < \cdots < q_\ell(n)$ we will concentrate on two important cases, namely, the ℓ-dependence case $q_j(n) = n+j-1$ and the long range dependence arithmetic progression case $q_j(n) = jn$ which leads to an interesting comparison of results for these two cases. After obtaining the tail behavior of the form (1.6) for summands of S_N we proceed to establishing limit theorems for S_N showing that for a particular class of polynomials F and certain sequences a_N and b_N,

$$\frac{1}{b_N}(S_N(t) - Nta_N)$$

weakly converges in the Skorokhod J_1 topology to an α_*-stable Lévy process. On the other hand, for general polynomials F in the ℓ-dependence case $q_i(n) = n+j-1$ the convergence in J_1 may not hold true though finite dimensional distributions always weakly converge. In the arithmetic progression case $q_j(n) = jn$, while the convergence in J_1 takes place for any polynomial F, the limiting process in some cases may have dependent increments.

In the ℓ-dependence case the summands form a stationary sequence, and so after verifying corresponding conditions it is possible to rely on previous results (see [16]). On the other hand, in the arithmetic progression case $q_j(n) = jn$ the sum S_N consists of summands with a strong long range dependence which do not form a stationary sequence. This does not enable us to rely directly on existing

results concerning stable limit theorems for sums of stationary weakly dependent random variables (see, for instance [7], [5], [6], [16] and references there). Some of our results can be extended to a wider class of random variables which have tail behavior given by (1.4) with more general slowly varying functions in place of powers of the logarithm but then most of our explicit computations will not be available.

2. Preliminaries and main results

Let $X_1, ..., X_\ell$ be independent random variables with tail distribution satisfying

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_j}(\ln z)^{-k_j} P\{\pm X_j > z\} = c_j^{\pm},\ j = 1, ..., \ell \tag{2.1}$$

for some $\alpha_j \in (0, 2)$, $k_j \geq 0$ and $c_j^{\pm} \geq 0$ with $c_j^+ + c_j^- > 0$, $j = 1, ..., \ell$. We will often consider a space $\mathcal{W}$ of bounded continuous functions W defined on some m-dimensional Euclidean space R^m and satisfying

$$|W(x)| \leq C|x|^2(1 + |x|^2)^{-1} \tag{2.2}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. It is known (see Theorem 3.6 of [13] and Lemma 7.3 in Appendix) that (2.1) holds true if and only if

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_j}(\ln z)^{-k_j} E[W(\frac{X_j}{z})] = \int W(x)(c_-^j \mathbf{1}_{x<0} + c_+^j \mathbf{1}_{x<0})\frac{dx}{|x|^{1+\alpha_j}} \tag{2.3}$$

for all $W \in \mathcal{W}$ (here $m = 1$) and $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$.

First, we want to establish the tail behavior of random variables $Y = F(X_1, ..., X_\ell)$ where F is a polynomial of the form

$$F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \tag{2.4}$$

where $\theta = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_\ell)$ is a multi index from a finite set Θ of multi indices of integers $\sigma_i > 0$ and $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x_1}^{\sigma_1} \cdots \mathbf{x}_\ell^{\sigma_\ell}$ is a monomial. We will also assume that Θ consists only of those θ for which $h_\theta \neq 0$.

Introduce the following notations

$$\alpha(\theta) = \min_{1\leq j\leq \ell} \tfrac{\alpha_j}{\sigma_j},\ J(\theta) = \{j : \tfrac{\alpha_j}{\sigma_j} = \alpha(\theta)\},\ p(\theta) = |J(\theta)| = \#\{j : \tfrac{\alpha_j}{\sigma_j} = \alpha(\theta)\}$$
$$k(\theta) = p(\theta) - 1 + \textstyle\sum_{j\in J(\theta)} k_j,\ \alpha_* = \min_{\theta\in\Theta} \alpha(\theta),\ k_* = \max_{\theta\in\Theta, \alpha(\theta)=\alpha_*} k(\theta)$$
$$\text{and } \Theta_* = \{\theta :\ \alpha(\theta) = \alpha_* \text{ and } k(\theta) = k_*\}.$$

Now we can state our first main result. Consider the collection of random variables $\{g_\theta(X_1, \ldots, X_\ell)\}$ and view them as a random vector $\mathbf{Z}$ in R^m where m is the cardinality of Θ.

2.1. **Theorem.** *(i) The limit*

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_*}(\ln z)^{-k_*} E[W(\frac{\mathbf{Z}}{z})] = \int_0^\infty \int_{S^{m-1}} W(rs)\frac{\nu(ds)\, dr}{r^{1+\alpha_*}} \tag{2.5}$$

exists for any $W \in \mathcal{W}$ with some measure ν on the sphere S^{m-1} satisfying $\nu(S^{m-1}) > 0$. Moreover, let m_* be the cardinality of Θ_* and R^{m_*} be any m_*-dimensional subspace containing the support of the distribution of the random vector $\{g_\theta^*(X_1, ..., X_\ell),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ where $g_\theta^* = g_\theta$ if $\theta \in \Theta_*$ and $g_\theta^* \equiv 0$ if $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_*$. Then $\nu\big(S^{m-1} \setminus (R^{m_*} \cap S^{m-1})\big) = 0$.

(ii) The tail behavior of the polynomial $Y = F(X_1, ..., X_\ell)$ is given by

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_*}(\ln z)^{-k_*} P\{\pm Y > z\} = c_\pm^F \tag{2.6}$$

where $c_F^\pm \geq 0$ satisfies $c_F^+ + c_F^- > 0$.

Theorem 2.1 claims, in particular, that the class of random variables satisfying (2.1) is closed with respect to taking products and sums of products of independent random variables. We will prove Theorem 2.1 by establishing first the joint tail behavior of the collection of monomials $\{g_\theta(X_1, ..., X_\ell),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ which is the assertion (i) and deduce from it the tail behavior of the linear combination $\sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta g_\theta(X_1, ..., X_\ell)$ which is the assertion (ii) of the theorem.

It is natural to inquire whether the wider class of random variables X_j satisfying (2.1) with arbitrary integers k_j is closed with respect to products of independent random variables, as well. This turns out to be false as the following example shows.

2.2. **Example.** Let X_1 and X_2 be independent symmetric random variables such that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha P\{X_1 > z\} = c_1 \text{ and } \lim_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha (\ln z) P\{X_2 > z\} = c_2. \tag{2.7}$$

Then

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha (\ln\ln z)^{-1} P\{X_1 X_2 > z\} = 2c_1 c_2 \alpha. \tag{2.8}$$

We will make necessary computations leading to (2.8) at the end of Section 3. This example also shows that it may be difficult to obtain general precise folmulas for tail asymptotics beyond the class of random variables satisfying (2.1).

Next, we consider a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $X_1, X_2, ...$ satisfying

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha (\ln z)^{-k} P\{\pm X_j > z\} = c_\pm \tag{2.9}$$

where, again, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, $k \geq 0$, $c^\pm \geq 0$ and $c^+ + c^- > 0$. For $0 \leq t \leq T$, set

$$S_N(\theta, t) = \sum_{1\leq n\leq Nt} g_\theta(X_{q_1(n)}, X_{q_2(n)}, ..., X_{q_\ell(n)}) \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$S_N(t) = \sum_{1\leq n\leq Nt} F(X_{q_1(n)}, X_{q_2(n)}, ..., X_{q_\ell(n)}) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta S_N(\theta, t). \tag{2.11}$$

Here F is the same as in (1.2) and (2.4) while the integer valued functions $1 \leq q_1(n) < q_2(n) < \cdots < q_\ell(n)$ will be considered here in two situations

$$\ell - \text{dependence case: } q_j(n) = n + j - 1,\ j = 1, 2, ..., \ell;\ n = 1, 2, ... \text{ and} \tag{2.12}$$

$$\text{arithmetic progression case: } q_j(n) = jn,\ j = 1, 2, ..., \ell;\ n = 1, 2, ... \tag{2.13}$$

Set

$$\sigma(\theta) = \max_{1\leq j\leq\ell} \sigma_j,\ \alpha(\theta) = \tfrac{\alpha}{\sigma(\theta)},\ J(\theta) = \{j : \sigma_j = \sigma(\theta)\};\ p(\theta) = \#\{j : j \in J(\theta)\},$$
$$k(\theta) = (k + 1)p(\theta) - 1 \text{ and } \alpha_* = \min_{\theta\in\Theta} \alpha(\theta),\ k_* = \max_{\theta:\alpha(\theta)=\alpha_*} k(\theta).$$

We define again Θ_* as above and observe that for all $\theta \in \Theta_*$,

$$p_* = p(\theta) = (k_* + 1)(k + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_* = \sigma(\theta) = \alpha\alpha_*^{-1}$$

are the same. We denote also by m_* the cardinality of Θ_*.

Consider the collection of random variables $\{Z_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$ where $Z_\theta = g_\theta(X_1, \dots, X_\ell)$. Let

$$b_N = N^{\frac{1}{\alpha_*}}(\frac{1}{\alpha_*}\ln N)^{\frac{k_*}{\alpha_*}}, \text{ and } a_N^\theta = E[\frac{b_N^2 Z_\theta}{b_N^2 + Z_\theta^2}]$$

In Section 5 we will establish the following limit theorem for the ℓ-dependence case.

2.3. **Theorem.** *Let $q_j(n)$ be defined by (2.12).*

(i) As $N \to \infty$, all finite dimensional distributions of the R^m valued process

$$\Xi_N(\theta, t) = \frac{1}{b_N}\big(S_N(\theta, t) - Nta_N^\theta\big),\ t \in [0, T],\ \theta \in \Theta \tag{2.14}$$

converge weakly to the corresponding finite dimensional distributions of an α_*-stable Lévy process $\{\Xi(\theta, t),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$, $t \in [0, T]$ where $\Xi(\theta, \cdot) \equiv 0$ for $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_*$. For each θ the process $\Xi_N(\theta, t)$ converges in J_1 topology but the R^m valued vector process $\{\Xi_N(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ may not converge weakly in any of Skorokhod's J_1, J_2, M_1 or M_2 topologies.

(ii) Suppose now that in the representation (2.10) there exists no pair $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ satisfying $J(\theta_2) = J(\theta_1) + r$ in the sense that there is no integer r such that $i \in J(\theta_1)$ if and only if $i + r \in J(\theta_2)$. Then, as $N \to \infty$, the vector process $\{\Xi_N(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ converges weakly in the J_1 topology on the space $D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^m)$ to the above α_*-stable vector Lévy process $\{\Xi(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ and the component processes $\Xi(\theta, \cdot)$ are mutually independent for different $\theta \in \Theta$.

(iii) The sum $\xi_N(t) = \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} h_\theta\, \Xi_N(\theta, t)$ converges to the α_*-stable Lévy process $\xi(t) = \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} h_\theta\, \Xi(\theta, t)$, in general, only in the sense of weak convergence of finite dimensional distributions while under the additional condition of (ii) the convergence is in the J_1 topology.

For the arithmetic progression case we will obtain in Section 6 the following result.

2.4. **Theorem.** *Let $S_N(\theta, t)$ and $\Xi_N(\theta, t)$ be defined by (2.10) and (2.14), respectively, with $q_j(n)$ defined by (2.13).*

(i) As $N \to \infty$, the R^m-valued vector process $\{\Xi_N(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ converges weakly in the J_1 topology on the space $D([0, T], \mathbb{R}^m)$ to a process $\{\Xi(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ where $\Xi(\theta, \cdot) \equiv 0$ for $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_*$. Each $\Xi(\theta, \cdot)$, $\theta \in \Theta_*$ is an α_* stable Lévy process but, in general, these processes are mutually dependent. Their dependence structure will be clarified in the proof. Furthermore, the vector process $\{\Xi(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta\}$ has, in general, dependent increments.

(ii) Suppose that in the representation (2.10) there exists no pair $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta_*$ satisfying $J(\theta_2) = r\, J(\theta_1)$ in the sense that there is no positive number r such that $i \in J(\theta_1)$ if and only if $ir \in J(\theta_2)$. Then, as $N \to \infty$, for each $\theta \in \Theta_*$ the process $\Xi_N(\theta, \cdot)$ weakly converges in J_1 topology to an α_*-stable Lévy process $\Xi(\theta, \cdot)$ and the latter processes are independent. Moreover, as $N \to \infty$ the vector process $\{\Xi_N(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta_*\}$ weakly converges in the J_1 topology of $D([0, T]; R^{m_*})$ to the m_*-dimensional α_* stable Lévy process $\{\Xi(\theta, \cdot),\ \theta \in \Theta_*\}$.

(iii) The sum $\xi_N(t) = \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} h_\theta \Xi_N(\theta, t)$, $t \in [0, T]$ converges weakly in the J_1 topology to an α_*-stable process $\xi(t) = \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} h_\theta\, \Xi(\theta, t)$, $t \in [0, T]$ which may have, in general, dependent increments but under the additional condition of (ii) this process has independent increments, i.e. it is a Lévy process.

Setting $Y_n = F(X_{q_1(n)}, X_{q_2(n)}, ..., X_{q_\ell(n)})$ we observe that when $q_j(n) = n+j-1$ then the sequence $\{Y_n, n \geq 1\}$ is stationary and ℓ-dependent, and it is known that under conditions which can be veryfied in our circumstances the stable limit theorem holds true (see, for instance, [16]). When $q_j(n) = jn$ the sequence $\{Y_n;\, n \geq 1\}$ is strongly long range dependent and it is not stationary. So we are not able to rely directly on any known results. We deal with this case establishing first a multidimensional stable limit theorem for $\Xi_N(\theta, t)$ splitting the whole sum into independent subsums similarly to [12] and applying some time rescaling. It turns out that under additional arithmetic conditions specified in the above theorems the limiting behavior as $N \to \infty$ of the process Ξ_N is similar in both cases (2.12) and (2.13) while, in general, it is quite different in these two cases. Indeed, in the ℓ-dependence case consider $F(x_1, x_2) = x_2 - x_1$ with $\ell = 2$ then $S_N(t) = X_{[Nt]} - X_1$ and it is not difficult to understand (see [2]) that all finite dimensional distributions of S_N/b_N converge to the unit mass at 0 while there is no weak convergence in any of Skorokhod's topologies. It is shown also in [2] that if, for instance, we take here $F(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2$ then there will be weak convergence of S_N/b_N in the M_1 topology but not in J_1. On the other hand, in the arithmetic progression case with $F(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2$ and $\ell = 2$ the weak convergence of S_N/b_N in J_1 will hold true but the increments of the limiting process on the time intervals $[T/4, T/2]$ and $[T/2, T]$ will be dependent. The same remains true for vector processes from Theorem 2.4(i) considering $g_{\theta_1}(x_1, x_2) = x_1$ and $g_{\theta_2}(x_1, x_2) = x_2$ so that we will be dealing with the sums $S_N(t) = \sum_{1 \leq n \leq Nt}(X_n, X_{2n})$. Then the partial sums from $TN/4$ to $TN/2$ and from $TN/2$ to TN will be strongly dependent which will lead to dependence of increments of the limiting vector process on the time intervals $[T/4, T/2)$ and $[T/2, T]$.

2.5. **Remark.** The truncated average $E(Z_\theta \mathbb{I}_{|Z_\theta| \leq b_n})$ is often taken as a centering expression in stable limit theorems in place of a_N^θ introduced above. The latter is more convenient for our purposes and this change does not influence convergence in the corresponding limit theorem but leads only to an additional drift term in the Lévy limiting process. Actually, we can interpret truncation in a wider sense as replacing EX by $E(f(X))$ where f is a bounded function and $|f(x) - x| = o(|x|^2)$ near 0. Two common choices are $f(x) = x\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \tau}(x)$ or $\frac{x}{1+|x|^2}$. They affect only the values of γ in the Lévy-Khintchine representations

$$\log \psi(t) = i < \gamma_1, t > + \int_{|x| \leq \tau} (e^{i<t,x>} - 1 - i < t, x >) + \int_{|x| > \tau} (e^{i<t,x>} - 1) dM(x)$$

or

$$\log \psi(t) = i < \gamma_2, t > + \int \big(e^{i<t,x>} - 1 - \frac{i < t, x >}{1 + |x|^2}\big) dM(x)$$

with

$$\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 + \int \big(x\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \tau} - \int \frac{x}{1 + |x|^2}\big) dM(x)$$

If we want to relate the truncated mean of $X+Y$ to the sum of the truncated means of X and Y it is easier to handle $f(X+Y) - f(X) - f(Y)$ with $f(x) = \frac{x}{1+|x|^2}$ than with $f(x) = x\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \tau}$. If we use the truncated mean with some $f(x)$ and center by subtracting the truncated mean then we end up in the limit with the representation

$$\log \psi(t) = \int [e^{i\ <t,x>} - 1 - i < t, f(x) >] dM(x)$$

with $\gamma = 0$. We can do one truncation and still go to the other representation by defining γ suitably (cf. [9]).

2.6. **Remark.** An obvious corollary of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 when $\alpha_* > 1$ is a weak law of large numbers saying that for all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} S_N(\theta, 1) = EZ_\theta$$

where convergence is considered in probabability. This is not new in the ℓ-dependence case since then the summands in $S_N(\theta, 1)$ form a stationary sequence but in the arithmetic progression case of Theorem 2.4 this assertion does not seem to follow directly from previous results.

3. Tails of products of independent random variables

Clearly, in order to establish Theorem 2.1 for products, i.e. $F(x_1, x_2, ..., x_\ell) = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_\ell$ it suffices to prove it for $\ell = 2$ and then to proceed by induction. Thus, we prove first

3.1. **Proposition.** *Let X_1 and X_2 be independent random variables such that X_1 satisfies (2.1) with $0 < \alpha_1 < 2$, $k_1 \geq 0$ and $c_1^{\pm} \geq 0$, $c_1^+ + c_1^- > 0$.*

(i) Suppose that for some $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$,

$$\limsup_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_2} P\{|X_2| > z\} = \rho < \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-k_1} P\{\pm X_1 X_2 > z\} \\ &= \alpha_1 \int_0^\infty x^{\alpha_1 - 1} (c_1^+ P\{\pm X_2 > x\} + c_1^- P\{\mp X_2 > x\}) dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

(ii) Suppose that X_2 satisfies (2.1) with $\alpha_2 = \alpha_1 \in (0, 2)$ and some $k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{0\}$ and $c_2^{\pm} \geq 0$, $c_2^+ + c_2^- > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} P\{\pm X_1 X_2 > z\} \\ &= \alpha_1 c^{\pm} \tfrac{\Gamma(k_1+1)\Gamma(k_2+1)}{\Gamma(k_1+k_2+2)} \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $c^+ = c_1^+ c_2^+ + c_1^- c_2^-$, $c^- = c_1^+ c_2^- + c_1^- c_2^+$ and Γ denotes the Gamma function.

Proof. The assertion (i) follows actually from the theorem of Breiman as presented by means of Proposition 7.5 in [13]. On the other hand, the assertion (ii) seems to be specific for the class of random variables satisfying (2.1) and for readers' convenience we will give the complete proof of the whole result here. In the proof we will employ several times integration by parts for Stiltjes integrals which will be legitimate since integrands in our circumstances will be differentiable (see, for instance, [3], Theorem 18.4 and remarks there or [15], Theorem 11 and Corollary 1 in §6, Ch.II). For any $z > 1$ we write

$$Q(z) = P\{X_1 X_2 > z\} = Q_1^+(z) + Q_1^-(z) + R_1(z) \tag{3.4}$$

where for some small $\delta > 0$,

$$Q_1^+(z) = E\mathbf{1}_{0<X_2\leq z/(\ln z)^\delta} P\{X_1 > \frac{z}{X_2} | X_2\},$$

$$Q_1^-(z) = E\mathbf{1}_{0>X_2\geq -z/(\ln z)^\delta} P\{-X_1 > \frac{z}{-X_2} | X_2\}$$

and by (3.1) or by (2.1) depending on the case,

$$|R_1(z)| \le P\{|X_2| > \frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}\} \le C_1 z^{-\alpha_2}(\ln z)^{\alpha_2\delta}\big(\ln \frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}\big)^{k_2} \tag{3.5}$$

for some $C_1 > 0$ independent of z. Next, set

$$Q_2^+(z) = c_1^+ E\mathbf{1}_{0<X_2<z/(\ln z)^\delta}\big(\tfrac{X_2}{z}\big)^{\alpha_1}\big(\ln \tfrac{z}{X_2}\big)^{k_1} = c_1^+ I_1^+(z)$$
$$\text{where } I_1^+(z) = \textstyle\int_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta}(\frac{x}{z})^{\alpha_1}(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1} dP\{X_2 \le x\}.$$

Then taking into account that $\frac{z}{X_2} \ge (\ln z)^\delta$ when $0 < X_2 < z/(\ln z)^\delta$ we obtain that

$$|Q_1^+(z) - Q_2^+(z)| \le I_1^+(z)R_2(z) \tag{3.6}$$

where by (2.1),

$$R_2(z) = \sup_{u\ge(\ln z)^\delta} |u^{\alpha_1}(\ln u)^{-k_1}P\{X_1 > u\} - c_1^+| \to 0 \text{ as } z \to \infty. \tag{3.7}$$

Now integrating by parts we obtain

$$I_1^+(z) = z^{-\alpha_1}x^{\alpha_1}(\ln \tfrac{z}{x})^{k_1}P\{X_2 \le x\}\big|_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} \tag{3.8}$$
$$-z^{-\alpha_1}\textstyle\int_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} x^{\alpha_1-1}\big(\alpha_1(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1} - k_1(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1-1}\big)P\{X_2 \le x\}dx = Q_3^+(z)$$

where

$$Q_3^+(z) = z^{-\alpha_1}\int_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} x^{\alpha_1-1}\big(\alpha_1(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1} - k_1(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1-1}\big)P\{\frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta} > X_2 > x\}dx.$$

Set

$$Q_4^+(z) = z^{-\alpha_1}\int_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} x^{\alpha_1-1}\big(\alpha_1(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1} - k_1(\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1-1}\big)P\{X_2 > x\}dx.$$

Then

$$|Q_3^+(z) - Q_4^+(z)| \le R_3(z)P\{|X_2| > z/(\ln z)^\delta\} \tag{3.9}$$

where changing variables $y = \ln \frac{z}{x}$ we have

$$R_3(z) = |\int_{\delta \ln\ln z}^\infty e^{-\alpha_1 y}(\alpha_1 y^{k_1} - k_1 y^{k_1-1})dy|.$$

Assuming $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$ we have from (3.1) that $x^{\alpha_2}P\{X_2 > x\}$ is bounded and then it follows easily that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1}(\ln z)^{-k_1}Q_4^+(z) = \alpha_1\int_0^\infty x^{\alpha_1-1}P\{X_2 > x\}dx \tag{3.10}$$

and the integral in (3.10) converges. On the other hand, when $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$, it follows from (3.1) and (3.5)–(3.9) that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1}(\ln z)^{-k_1}|Q_1^+(z) - c_1^+Q_4^+(z)| = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

This together with (3.10) and similar estimates for $Q_1^-(z)$ yields (3.2) proving (i).

Next we complete the proof of (ii) considering the case $\alpha_2 = \alpha_1$. By (2.1),

$$R_4(u) = \sup_{w\ge u}|c_2^+ - w^{\alpha_2}(\ln w)^{-k_2}P\{X_2 > w\}| \to 0 \text{ as } u \to \infty. \tag{3.12}$$

For each $\varepsilon > 0$ choose $u_\varepsilon \ge 1$ so that

$$R_4(u_\varepsilon) \le \varepsilon \text{ and } u_\varepsilon \to \infty \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{3.13}$$

If z is large enough so that $z/(\ln z)^{\delta} > u_\varepsilon$ then setting $y = \ln x$ we write

$$Q_5^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = c_2^+ I_2^{(\varepsilon)}(z) \text{ where}$$
$$I_2^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = z^{-\alpha_1} \int_{u_\varepsilon}^{z/(\ln z)^{\delta}} x^{-1} (\ln x)^{k_2} \big(\alpha_1 (\ln \tfrac{z}{x})^{k_1} - k_1 (\ln \tfrac{z}{x})^{k_1 - 1}\big) dx$$
$$= c_2^+ z^{-\alpha_1} \int_{u_\varepsilon}^{\ln z - \delta \ln \ln z} y^{k_2} \big(\alpha_1 (\ln z - y)^{k_1} - k_1 (\ln z - y)^{k_1 - 1}\big) dy$$

and

$$Q_6^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = z^{-\alpha_1} \int_0^{u_\varepsilon} x^{\alpha_1 - 1} \big(\alpha_1 (\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1} - k_1 (\ln \frac{z}{x})^{k_1 - 1}\big) P\{X_2 > x\} dx.$$

Then

$$|Q_4^+(z) - Q_5^{(\varepsilon)}(z) - Q_6^{(\varepsilon)}(z)| \le \varepsilon I_2^{(\varepsilon)}.. \tag{3.14}$$

Changing variables $u = \frac{y}{\ln z}$ and integrating by parts repeatedly we obtain

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} I_2^{(\varepsilon)}(z) \tag{3.15}$$
$$= \alpha_1 \int_0^1 u^{k_2} (1-u)^{k_1} du = \alpha_1 \tfrac{\Gamma(k_1+1)\Gamma(k_2+1)}{\Gamma(k_1+k_2+2)}$$

since the last integral above is the well known β-function $B(k_1+1, k_2+1)$. On the other hand,

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} Q_6^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Now observe that by (3.5) choosing $\delta < \frac{k_1}{\alpha_1}$ we have

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} |R_1(z)| = 0. \tag{3.17}$$

Similarly, by (3.5) and (3.9),

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} |Q_3^+(z) - Q_4^+(z)| = 0. \tag{3.18}$$

It follows from (3.8), (3.9), (3.12)–(3.16) and (3.18) that the (finite) limit

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} Q_2^+(z)$$

exists. Since $\lim_{z\to\infty} R_2(z) = 0$ by (3.7) we see from (3.6) that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_1} (\ln z)^{-(k_1+k_2+1)} |Q_1^+(z) - Q_2^+(z)| = 0. \tag{3.19}$$

Finally, (3.8) and (3.14)–(3.19) together with similar estimates for $Q_1^-(z)$ yields (3.3) with " $+$ " while (3.3) with " $-$ " follows in the same way. □

3.2. **Remark.** Suppose that X_1 and X_2 are positive random variables having the tail behavior $P\{X_i > x\} \sim c_i x^{-\alpha_i} (\ln x)^{k_i}$, $i = 1, 2$ as $x \to \infty$ with $\alpha_i, c_i > 0$ and $k_i \ge 0$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $Y_i = \ln X_i$, $i = 1, 2$ have the tail behavior $P\{Y_i > y\} \sim c_i e^{-\alpha_i} y^{k_i}$, $i = 1, 2$ as $y \to \infty$. The latter tail behavior (with a proper normalization) is the same as for the Γ-distribution with parameters $k_i + 1$ and α_i^{-1}. Thus, we can first study the tail behavior of the sum $Y_1 + Y_2$ of two independent random variables Y_1 and Y_2 having the Γ-distribution with parameters $k_1 + 1, \alpha_1^{-1}$ and $k_2 + 1, \alpha^{-1}$, respectively, and then consider $\exp(Y_1 + Y_2)$. This is strightforward when $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$ since then $Y_1 + Y_2$ has the Γ-distribution with parameters $k_1 + k_2 + 2$, α^{-1}. If $\alpha_1 \ne \alpha_2$ then one has to obtain the tail behavior of a convolution of two Γ-distributions which involves computation of some integrals. Of course, we can take the logarithm only if X_1 and X_2 are positive but negative values can be

treated similarly considering positive tails of $-X_1$ and $-X_2$. Still, one has to take special care of the cases when some of c_i's are zero and when X_i's may take on zero values.

Proceeding by induction in the number of variables we derive from Proposition 3.1 the following result.

3.3. **Corollary.** *Theorem 2.1 holds true for any monomial*

$$F(X_1,...,X_\ell) = X_1^{\sigma_1}X_2^{\sigma_2}\cdots X_\ell^{\sigma_\ell},\ \sigma_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$$

where $X_1,...,X_\ell$ are independent random variables satisfying (2.1).

Proof. Observe first that the assertions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.1 coincide here since now F consists of only one monomial, and so the descriptions of the tail behavior (2.5) and (2.6) are equivalent in view of Theorem 3.6 in [13] and Lemma 7.3 of Appendix.

Next, set $Y_i = X_i^{\sigma_i}$, $i = 1,...,\ell$. Then (2.1) implies that for $i = 1,...,\ell$,

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_i/\sigma_i}(\ln z)^{-k_i}P\{-Y_i > z\} = 0 \text{ if } \sigma_i \text{ is even and} \tag{3.20}$$

(3.21)

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_i/\sigma_i}(\ln z)^{-k_i}P\{\pm Y_i > z\} = \lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_i/\sigma_i}(\ln z)^{-k_i}P\{\pm X_i > z^{1/\sigma_i}\} = \sigma_i^{-k_i}c_i^{\pm}$$

provided σ_i is odd and, furthermore, if $\sigma_i > 0$ is even then

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha_i/\sigma_i}(\ln z)^{-k_i}P\{\pm Y_i > z\} = \lim_{z\to\infty} \tag{3.22}$$
$$z^{\alpha_i/\sigma_i}(\ln z)^{-k_i}(P\{X_i > z^{1/\sigma_i}\} + P\{X_i < -z^{1/\sigma_i}\}) = \sigma_i^{-k_i}(c_i^+ + c_i^-).$$

Next, we proceed by induction in ℓ. For $\ell = 1$ the result follows from (3.20)–(3.22). Suppose that it still holds true for $\ell = 1,2,...,n-1$. In order to obtain it for $\ell = n$ we set $Z = Y_1\cdots Y_{n-1}$. Then by the induction hypothesis

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha}(\ln z)^{-k}P\{\pm Z > z\} = c^{\pm}$$

for some α, k and $c^{\pm}$ described in Theorem 2.1. Since Y_n satisfies (3.20)–(3.22) we derive the result for ZY_n from Proposition 3.1 completing both the induction step and the proof of this corollary. □

Next, we derive (2.8) of Example 2.2. We write

$$Q_0(z) = P\{X_1X_2 > z\} = 2Q_1(z) + R_1(z) \tag{3.23}$$

where $Q_1(z) = Q_1^+(z) = Q_1^-(z)$ and $R_1(z)$ are the same as in (3.4) and now

$$|R_1(z)| \le P\{|X_2| > \frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}\} \le Cz^{-\alpha}(\ln z)^{\alpha\delta}\big(\ln\frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}\big)^{-1} \tag{3.24}$$

for some $C > 0$. Similarly to (3.6) we have also

$$|Q_1^+(z) - Q_2^+(z)| \le \frac{1}{c_1^+}Q_2^+(z)R_2(z) \tag{3.25}$$

where

$$Q_2(z) = c_1E\mathbf{1}_{0<X_2<\frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}}(\frac{X_2}{z})^\alpha = c_1z^{-\alpha}\int_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} x^\alpha dP\{X_2 \le x\} \tag{3.26}$$

and

$$R_2(z) = \sup_{u\ge(\ln z)^\delta} |u^\alpha P\{X_1 > u\} - c_1|.$$

Next, we write

$$Q_2(z) = Q_3(z) - R_3(z) \tag{3.27}$$

where

$$Q_3(z) = c_1\alpha z^{-\alpha}\int_0^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} x^{\alpha-1}dP\{X_2 > x\}dx - R_3(z)$$

and by (3.23),

$$R_3(z) = \frac{c_1}{(\ln z)^{\delta\alpha}}P\{X_2 > \frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}\} \le Cc_1z^{-\alpha}\big(\ln\frac{z}{(\ln z)^\delta}\big)^{-1}. \tag{3.28}$$

Now, we write

$$Q_3(z) = Q_4^{(\varepsilon)}(z) + Q_5^{(\varepsilon)}(z) + R_4^{(\varepsilon)}(z) \tag{3.29}$$

where

$$Q_4^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = c_1\alpha z^{-\alpha}\int_0^{u_\varepsilon} x^{\alpha-1}P\{X_2 > x\}dx \le c_1z^{-\alpha}u_\varepsilon^\alpha, \tag{3.30}$$

$$Q_5^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = c_1c_2\alpha z^{-\alpha}\int_{u_\varepsilon}^{z/(\ln z)^\delta} x^{-1}(\ln x)^{-1}dx = c_1c_2\alpha z^{-\alpha}\ln\big(\frac{\ln -\delta\ln\ln z}{\ln u_\varepsilon}\big) \tag{3.31}$$

and

$$|R_4^{(\varepsilon)}(z)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{c_2\alpha}Q_5^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = \varepsilon c_1z^{-\alpha}\ln\big(\frac{\ln -\delta\ln\ln z}{\ln u_\varepsilon}\big) \tag{3.32}$$

provided $u_\varepsilon \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is chosen so that

$$\sup_{w\ge u_\varepsilon}|c_2 - w^\alpha(\ln w)P\{X_2 > w\}| \le \varepsilon.$$

By (3.29)–(3.32),

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha(\ln\ln z)^{-1}Q_3(z) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{z\to\infty} Q_5^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = c_1c_2\alpha \tag{3.33}$$

which together with (3.23)–(3.28) yields (2.8). □

4. Tails of polynomials

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 we will view the collection of monomials which compose the polynomial F as a vector and fit them into the following setup. For $i = 1, 2, ..., M$ let $Z_i = (Z_{i1}, Z_{i2}, ..., Z_{im_i})$ be m_i-dimensional random vectors and $\mathcal{W}_i$ be the spaces of bounded continuous functions W on R^{m_i} satisfying (2.2). Suppose that for each i and any $W \in \mathcal{W}_i$,

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E[W(\frac{Z_i}{\rho})] = \int_0^\infty\int_{S^{m_i-1}} W(sz)\frac{\nu_i(ds)dz}{|z|^{1+\alpha}} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and ν_i are measures on S^{m_i-1}, $i = 1, ..., M$ with $\nu_i(S^{m_i-1}) > 0$. Let also $Z_0 = (Z_{01}, ..., Z_{0,m_0})$ be a m_0-dimensional random vector such that

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}P\{|Y_0| > \rho\} = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

4.1. **Lemma.** *With the above notations consider the* $m = \sum_{i=0}^{M} m_i$*-dimensional random vector* $Z = (Z_0, Z_1, ..., Z_M)$ *and assume that*

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} P\{|Z_{il_1}| > \rho,\ |Z_{jl_2}| > \rho\} = 0 \tag{4.3}$$

for any $i, j = 1, ..., M$, $i \neq j$ *and* $1 \le l_1 \le m_i$, $1 \le l_2 \le m_j$. *Then for each bounded continuous* W *on* R^m *satisfying (2.2) the limit,*

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\frac{Z}{\rho})] = \int_0^{\infty} \int_{S^{m-1}} W(sx) \frac{\nu(ds)dx}{|x|^{1+\alpha}} \tag{4.4}$$

exists with a measure ν *supported on* $S^{m-1} \cap (\cup_{i=1}^{M} \Gamma_i)$ *where* $\Gamma_i = (0, ..., 0, R^{m_i}, 0, ..., 0)$, $i = 1, ..., M$. *Moreover, the projection to* R^{m_i} *of the restriction* $\nu|_{\Gamma_i}$ *coinsides with* ν_i, $i = 1, ..., M$.

Proof. In view of (4.2) and (4.3) any weak limit as $\rho \to \infty$ of the distributions

$$\rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} P\{\frac{Z}{\rho} \in \cdot\}$$

has support on $\cup_{i=1}^{M} \Gamma_i$, and by (4.1) the limiting measure ν exists and the projection of $\nu|_{\Gamma_i}$ to R^{m_i} coincides with ν_i. □

We will need also the following result where we denote by $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{W}_m$ the spaces of bounded continuous functions on R and R^m, respectively, satisfying (2.2).

4.2. **Lemma.** *Let a scalar random variable* V *be such that for some* α, k *with* $0 < \alpha < 2$, $k \ge 0$ *and all* $W \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\frac{V}{\rho})] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (c_- \mathbf{1}_{x<0} + c_+ \mathbf{1}_{x>0}) W(x) \frac{dx}{|x|^{1+\alpha}}.$$

Next, let Y *be a random vector in* R^m *independent of* V *and satisfying* $E[|Y|^{\alpha}] < \infty$. *Then the tail behavior of the vector* $Z = VY$ *is given by the limit*

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\frac{Z}{\rho})] = \int_0^{\infty} \int_{S^{m-1}} W(sx) \frac{\nu(ds)\, dx}{|x|^{1+\alpha}} \tag{4.5}$$

which holds true for any $W \in \mathcal{W}_m$. *The measure* $\nu(ds)$ *on* S^{m-1} *is computed for subsets* $A \subset S^{m-1}$ *from the identity*

$$E[\int_0^{\infty} (c_+ W(xY) + c_- W(-xY)] \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha}}) dx = \int_{S^{m-1}} \int_0^{\infty} W(sr) \frac{\nu(ds)dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}$$

as

$$\nu(A) = c_+ \int_{\widehat{A}} |\mathbf{y}|^{\alpha} d\lambda + c_- \int_{-\widehat{A}} |\mathbf{y}|^{\alpha} d\lambda$$

where $\widehat{A}$ *is the cone* $\cup_{\sigma>0} \sigma A$, $-\widehat{A} = \cup_{\sigma<0} \sigma A$ *and* λ *is the distribution of* Y *on* R^m.

Proof. Given $W \in \mathcal{W}$, for each fixed $\mathbf{y} \in R^m$ as a function of x, $W(x\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{W}$ on R. Therefore

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\frac{V\mathbf{y}}{\rho})] = \int_0^{\infty} (c_+ W(x\mathbf{y}) + c_- W(-x\mathbf{y})) \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha}}$$

Moreover, the convergence is easily seen to be uniform over bounded sets of $\mathbf{y}$. Hence if $\rho \ge 3$,

$$\sup_{\rho\ge 3} \sup_{\|\mathbf{y}\|\le 1} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\frac{V\mathbf{y}}{\rho})] \le C.$$

If $1 \le |\mathbf{y}| \le \frac{\rho}{3}$ then setting $\rho' = \frac{\rho}{|\mathbf{y}|} \ge 3$, writing $\mathbf{y} = |\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{y}'$ with $|\mathbf{y}'| = 1$ and observing that $\rho' \le \rho$ we obtain

$$\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E[W(\tfrac{V\mathbf{y}}{\rho})] = \rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E[W(\tfrac{V\mathbf{y}'}{\rho|\mathbf{y}|^{-1}})] = \rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E[W(\tfrac{V\mathbf{y}'}{\rho'})]$$
$$\le \tfrac{\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}}{(\rho')^\alpha(\ln\rho')^{-k}}(\rho')^\alpha(\ln\rho')^{-k}E[W(\tfrac{V\mathbf{y}'}{\rho'})] \le C\tfrac{\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}}{(\rho')^\alpha(\ln\rho')^{-k}} \le C|\mathbf{y}|^\alpha.$$

If $|\mathbf{y}| \ge \frac{\rho}{3}$ and $\ln\rho \ge 1$ then

$$\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E[W(\frac{V\mathbf{y}}{\rho})] \le \|W\|_\infty\rho^\alpha \le C|\mathbf{y}|^\alpha.$$

We can now apply the dominated convergence theorem to conclude that

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E[W(\frac{VY}{\rho})] = E\int_0^\infty (c_+W(xY) + c_-W(-xY))\frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha}}.$$

Replacing $W(\cdot)$ by $W(\sigma\,\cdot)$ and changing variables we see that

$$E\int_0^\infty (c_+W(xY) + c_-W(-xY))\frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha}}$$

is homogeneous of order α under dilation and therefore can be expressed as

$$\int_{S^{m-1}}\int_0^\infty W(rs)\frac{\nu(ds)dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}$$

where for a Borel $A \subset S^{m-1}$,

$$\nu(A) = c_+\int_{\widehat{A}}|\mathbf{y}|^\alpha d\lambda + c_-\int_{-\widehat{A}}|\mathbf{y}|^\alpha d\lambda$$

with λ being the distribution of Y. If Y is a scalar then the Lévy measure on R is given for each Borel $A \subset R$ by

$$\nu(A) = \int_A (c_-^*\mathbf{1}_{x<0} + c^*\mathbf{1}_{x>0})\frac{dx}{|x|^{1+\alpha}}$$

where

$$c_-^* = c_+\int_{-\infty}^0 |y|^\alpha d\lambda + c_-\int_0^\infty |y|^\alpha d\lambda$$

and

$$c_+^* = c_-\int_{-\infty}^0 |y|^\alpha d\lambda + c_+\int_0^\infty |y|^\alpha d\lambda.$$

□

In order to apply Lemma 4.1 to the collection of monomials composing the polynomial F we will need the following result which will ensure the compliance with the condition (4.3).

4.3. **Lemma.** *Let $Y = V_1V_2$ and $Z = V_2V_3$ where V_1, V_2 and V_3 are independent random variables such that*

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha(\ln z)^{-u_i}P\{\pm V_i > z\} = v_i^\pm \tag{4.6}$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $u_i \ge 0$, $v_i^+ + v_i^- > 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then

$$\limsup_{z\to\infty} z^\alpha(\ln z)^{-u_2}P\{|Y| > z,\, |Z| > z\} < \infty. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. Observe that

$$P\{|Y|>z,\,|Z|>z\}\le P\{|YZ|^{1/2}>z\}=P\{|V_1V_2|^{1/2}|V_2|>z\}. \tag{4.8}$$

By (4.6) and Proposition 3.1,

$$\limsup_{z\to\infty} z^{2\alpha}(\ln z)^{-(u_1+u_3+1)}P\{|V_1V_2|^{1/2}>z\}<\infty,$$

and so, again, by (4.6) and Proposition 3.1,

$$\limsup_{z\to\infty} z^{\alpha}(\ln z)^{-u_2}P\{|V_1V_3|^{1/2}|V_2|>z\}<\infty$$

which together with (4.8) gives (4.7). □

4.4. **Corollary.** *Let θ_1,θ_2 be two multi indices with corresponding monomials $g_{\theta_1}=\Pi_{j=1}^{\ell}x_j^{\sigma_j}$ and $g_{\theta_2}=\Pi_{j=1}^{\ell}x_j^{\tau_j}$. If $\alpha(\theta_1)=\alpha(\theta_2)=\alpha^*$ and $k(\theta_1)=k(\theta_2)=k^*$ but $J(\theta_1)\ne J(\theta_2)$, then*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} x^{\alpha^*}(\log x)^{-k^*}P[|g_{\theta_1}(X_1,\dots,X_\ell)|\ge x,\,|g_{\theta_2}(X_1,\dots,X_\ell)|\ge x]=0$$

Proof. In Lemma 4.3 set $Y=g_{\theta_1}(X_1,...,X_\ell)$, $Z=g_{\theta_1}(X_1,...,X_\ell)$ and $V_2=\prod_{i=1}^{m}X_{j_i}$ where $j_1,...,j_m\in J(\theta_1)\cap J(\theta_2)$ while if the latter intersection is empty we take $V=1$. Now, the result follows immediately from Lemma 4.3. □

Now we are able to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. Order arbitrarily the sets $J(\theta)$, $\theta\in\Theta_*$ and denote these different sets by $J_1,J_2,...,J_M$. Next, we define vectors Z_i, $i=1,...,M$ so that Z_i consists of different monomials g_θ, $\theta\in\Theta_*$ having the form

$$g_\theta=(\prod_{j\in J_i}x_j)^{\sigma_*}\prod_{l\notin J_i,\sigma_l\in\theta}x_l^{\sigma_l} \tag{4.9}$$

observing that $\sigma_l<\sigma_*$ here for all $l\notin J_i$. Define also the vector Z_0 which consists of monomials g_θ, $\theta\in\Theta\setminus\Theta_*$ taken with an arbitrary order. In order to obtain (4.1) for Z_i, $i\ge 1$ consider random variables $V_i=(\prod_{j\in J_i}X_j)^{\sigma_*}$ and form random vectors Y_i which consist of random monomials $\prod_{l\notin J_i,\sigma_l\in\theta}X_l^{\sigma_l}$, so that $Z_i=V_iY_i$. Next, the conditions of Lemma 4.2 are verified relying on Corollary 3.3 which enables us to apply Lemma 4.2 in order to obtain (4.1) with $\alpha=\alpha_*$ and $k=k_*$. Now, for such α and k the condition (4.2) follows from Corollary 3.3 and the condition (4.3) follows from Lemma 4.3 using Corollary 3.3. Hence, applying Lemma 4.1 we derive the assertion (i) of Theorem 2.1. Since taking the sum of components of vectors is a particular case of a linear map the assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.1 follows from (i), Lemma 7.3 and the following observation.

4.5. **Lemma.** *(see Proposition 7.3 of* [13]*) Suppose that a random m-dimensional vector Z satisfies (4.4) for some measure ν on S^{m-1} with $\nu(S^{m-1})>0$ and any bounded continuous function W satisfying (2.2). Let $T:R^m\to R^d$, $d\le m$ be a linear map. Then $Z'=TZ$ will again satisfy (4.4) with Z',ν' and d in place of Z,ν and m where ν' is defined for any Borel set $\Gamma\subset S^{d-1}$ by*

$$\nu'(\Gamma)=\int_{S^{m-1}}\mathbf{1}_\Gamma(\frac{Ts}{|Ts|})|Ts|^{\alpha}\nu(ds).$$

Proof. The result follows considering bounded continuous functions $\tilde W$ on R^d which satisfy (2.2) while observing that $W(x)=\tilde W(Tx)$ is a bounded continuous function on R^m satisfying (2.2) to which we can apply (4.4). □

5. Limit theorem in the ℓ-dependence case

In this section we will prove Theorem 2.3. We are dealing here with the sums

$$S_N(\theta,t)=\sum_{1\le n\le Nt} g_\theta(X_n,X_{n+1},...,X_{n+\ell-1}),\ \theta\in\Theta \tag{5.1}$$

containing the summands which form a stationary ℓ-dependent sequence. By this reason our proof will rely on the following result which appears in [16] as Corollary 1.4.

5.1. **Proposition.** *Let $\{Z_n\}$ be a stationary ℓ-dependent sequence with values in R^d which satisfies (4.1) and such that for any $j=2,3,...,\ell$ and $\delta>0$,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} NP\{|Z_1|>\delta b_N \text{ and } |Z_j|>\delta b_N\}=0 \tag{5.2}$$

where $b_N=N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(\frac{\ln N}{\alpha})^{\frac{k}{\alpha}}$. Set $a_N=E(\frac{b_N^2 Z_1}{b_N^2+|Z_1|^2})$. Then the process

$$\Upsilon_N(t)=\frac{1}{b_N}(\sum_{1\le n\le Nt} Z_n - Nta_N) \tag{5.3}$$

weakly converges in the J_1 topology on $D([0,T],R^d)$ to an α-stable Lévy process with the same Lévy measure as Z_1.

Actually, the identification of the limiting Lévy measure is not stated explicitly in Corollary 1.4 of [16] but this follows from the proof there. In Appendix we will exhibit a more general result for the ℓ-dependent stationary sequences which will yield either convergence in the J_1 topology or only of finite dimensional distributions depending on whether the condition (5.2) is assumed or not and we will describe in both cases limiting Lévy measures. We will give a direct proof there unlike Corollary 1.4 of [16] which follows from a more general result whose proof relies on the point processes machinery.

Observe that the one dimensional version of Proposition 5.1 is applicable to each sum $S_N(\theta,t)$, $\theta\in\Theta_*$ in (5.1). Indeed, each $g_\theta,\theta\in\Theta_*$ has the form

$$g_\theta(x_1,...,x_\ell)=(\prod_{i=1}^{p_*} x_{j_i}^{\sigma_*})f_\theta(x_{p_*+1},...,x_\ell) \tag{5.4}$$

where $J(\theta)=(j_1,j_2,...,j_{p_*})$ and f_θ is a monomial in complementary to $x_{j_1},...,x_{j_{p_*}}$ variables rised to powers lower than σ_*. Then for $n_1\neq n_2$ we can apply Lemma 4.3 setting there $Y=g_\theta(X_{n_1},X_{n_1+1},...,X_{n_1+\ell-1})$, $Z=g_\theta(X_{n_2},X_{n_2+1},...,X_{n_2+\ell-1})$ and defining V_2 as the common part of the products $\prod_{i=1}^{p_*}X_{n_1+j_i-1}^{\sigma_*}$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{p_*}X_{n_2+j_i-1}^{\sigma_*}$ (taking $V_2=1$ if these products do not have a common part). This will yield the condition (5.2) for the (scalar) sequence $Z_n=g_\theta(X_n,X_{n+1},...,X_{n+\ell-1})$.

The main problem in application of Proposition 5.1 to the vector sums $\{S_N(\theta,t),\theta\in\Theta\}$ is that, in general, we may have pairs of large (vector) summands there so that the condition (5.2) will not hold true. Indeed, consider a simple example with $F(x_1,x_2)=x_1+x_2$ and $q_1(n)=n$, $q_2(n)=n+1$ so that $\theta_1=(1,0)$, $\theta_2=(0,1)$ and $g_{\theta_i}(x_1,x_2)=x_i$, $i=1,2$. Then both vectors $Z_n=(g_{\theta_1}(X_n,X_{n+1}))=(X_n,X_{n+1})$ and $Z_{n+1}=(X_{n+1},X_{n+2})$ may be large in norm if $|X_{n+1}|$ is large. In other words, the probability $P\{|Z_1|>\delta b_N,|Z_2|>\delta b_N\}$ may be of the same order as $P\{|X_1|>\delta b_N\}$ which is of order $1/N$. We observe

that in this situation there is no weak convergence of the process Υ_N from (5.3) in the J_1 topology. Indeed, if this convergence would take place then also the process $\xi_N(t) = b_N^{-1}\sum_{1\le n\le Nt}(X_n+X_{n+1})$ would weakly converge in the J_1 topology which is false as shown in [2].

In order to adjust our sums to requirements of Proposition 5.1 we will perform a rearrangement procedure which will produce new sums $\mathcal{S}_N(\theta,t)$ not much different from $S_N(\theta,t)$ where large pairs of summands can emerge only with negligible probability. In the above simple example we will set $\mathcal{Z}_n = (X_{n+1}, X_{n+1})$ for $n \ge 2$ and the latter vector sequence will satisfy the conditions of Proposition 5.1. This yields the convergence in the J_1 topology of the process $\tilde\Upsilon_N(t)$ obtained from $\Upsilon_N(t)$ by replacing Z_n by $\mathcal{Z}_n$ but the estimate

$$|\sum_{1\le n\le Nt} Z_n - \sum_{2\le n\le Nt}\mathcal{Z}_n| \le |X_1| + |X_{[Nt]}|$$

does not enable us to obtain convergence of Υ_N in the J_1 topology but only provide weak convergence of finite dimensional distributions. In Appendix we will exhibit an alternative approach which will yield directly convergence of finite dimensional distributions without the condition (5.2) as required in Theorem 2.3(i) and the rearrangement which is special for the polynomial setup here will not be used there.

In order to deal with the general case we consider the disjoint subsets $\Psi_1, \Psi_2, ..., \Psi_r$ of Θ_* which are not singletons and such that for each pair $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Psi_i$ the sets $J(\theta_1) = (i_1, ..., i_{p_*})$ and $J(\theta_2) = (j_1, ..., j_{p_*})$ have the differences $j_l - i_l$, $l = 1, ..., p_*$ equal to a constant independent of l. If there are no such (non singleton) subsets of Θ_* then we are in the circumstances of the second part of Theorem 2.3 where there is no need in a rearrangement applying directly Proposition 5.1 and this case will be discussed later on. Thus, we assume now that such subsets exist. In each Ψ_i, $i = 1, ..., r$ choose θ_i such that $J(\theta_i) = (j_{i1}, j_{i2}, ..., j_{ip_*})$ has the maximal first index j_{i1} where we set the order $j_{i1} < j_{i2} < ... < j_{ip_*}$ in $J(\theta_i)$. Then there exist integers $0 = a_{i1} < a_{i2} < ... < a_{iz_i} < j_{i1}$ such that $\Psi_i = \{\theta_{i1}, \theta_{i2}, ..., \theta_{iz_i}\}$ and $J(\theta_{il}) = (j_{i1} - a_{il}, j_{i2} - a_{il}, ..., j_{ip_*} - a_{il})$ for each $l = 1, 2, ..., z_i$.

The goal of our rearrangement procedure is to produce new vector summands $\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta)$, $\theta \in \Theta_*$ which will replace the summands $Y_n(\theta) = g_\theta(X_n, X_{n+1}, ..., X_{n+\ell-1})$, $\theta \in \Theta_*$ in (5.1) so that Proposition 5.1 could be applied to the new sum while the difference between these two sums can be controlled.

If θ does not belong to some Ψ_i (in particular, if $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_*$) defined above then we set $\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) = Y_n(\theta)$. Now, suppose that $\theta = \theta_{il}$ for some $1 \le l \le z_i$. then for all $n \ge \ell$ set

$$\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta) = g_\theta(X_{n+a_{il}}, X_{n+a_{il}+1}, ..., X_{n+a_{il}+\ell-1}) = Y_{n+a_{il}}(\theta). \tag{5.5}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{S}_N(\theta,t)\sum_{\ell\le n\le Nt}\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta). \tag{5.6}$$

It is easy to see that

$$|S_N(\theta,t) - \mathcal{S}_N(\theta,t)| \le (\sum_{1\le n\le 2\ell} + \sum_{Nt\le n\le Nt+\ell})|g_\theta(X_n, X_{n+1}, ..., X_{n+\ell-1})|. \tag{5.7}$$

Relying on Lemma 4.3 it is easy to see that the vector summands $\mathcal{Z}_n = (\mathcal{Y}_n(\theta),\, \theta \in \Theta)$ satisfy the condition (5.2) of Proposition 5.1 (considered with $\mathcal{Z}_n$ in place of Z_n), and so as $N \to \infty$ the processes $\Upsilon_N(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$ defined by (5.3) (again, with

$\mathcal{Z}_n$ in place of Z_n) weakly converge in the J_1 topology on $D([0,T],\, R^m)$ to an α_*-stable vector Lévy process $\{\Xi(\theta,t),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$, $t\in[0,T]$. The estimate (5.7) enable us to conclude from here that all finite dimensional distributions of the vector process $\{\Xi_N(\theta,t),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$, $t\in[0,T]$ weakly converge to the corresponding finite dimensional distributions of $\{\Xi(\theta,t),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$, $t\in[0,T]$. Clearly, $\frac{1}{b_N}\{\Xi_N(\theta,t),\, \theta\in\Theta\setminus\Theta_*\}$ will converge to zero in probability.

Still, the estimate (5.7), in general, does not yield weak convergence of the vector process $\{\Xi_N(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$ in any of Skorokhod's topologies. Indeed, take $F(x_1,x_2)=x_1-x_2$, $Z_n=(X_n,-X_{n+1})$ with X_j satisfying (2.9) and define Υ_N by (5.3). The weak convergence of $\Upsilon_N(\cdot)$ as $N\to\infty$ would imply the weak convergence of the process $\frac{1}{b}{}_N(X_{[Nt]}-X_1)$, $t\in[0,T]$ which does not converge in any of Skorokhod's topologies as explained in [2].

The above provides the proof of the assertion (i) of Theorem 2.3. In order to derive the assertion (ii) we observe that since there exist no non singleton subsets Ψ_i satisfying conditions of the above proof it follows that already the vector summands $Z_n=(Y_n(\theta),\, \theta\in\Theta)$ satisfy (5.2) of Proposition 5.1, and so the vector process $\Upsilon_N(t)=\{\Xi_N(\theta,t),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$, $t\in[0,T]$ weakly converges in the J_1-topology to an α_*-stable Lévy process $\{\Xi(\theta,t),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$, $t\in[0,T]$.

In order to prove that the component processes $\Xi(\theta,\cdot)$ will be independent for different θ it suffices to show that the Lévy measure of the vector process $\{\Xi(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta\}$ will be concentrated on axes. Relying on Section 4 from [16] we conclude that the latter follows if the random vector $Z=(Y_1(\theta),\, \theta\in\Theta)$ satisfies (4.4) with the Lévy measure ν supported on the axes, i.e.

$$\nu\{(x_1,...,x_2):\, |x_i|>0 \text{ and } |x_j|>0,\, i\neq j\}=0.$$

The latter will hold true if we show that for any $\theta,\tilde\theta\in\Theta$, $\theta\neq\tilde\theta$ and $\delta>0$,

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^{\alpha_*}(\ln\rho)^{-k_*}P\{|Y_1(\theta)|>\rho \text{ and } |Y_1(\tilde\theta)|>\rho\}=0. \tag{5.8}$$

If $\theta,\tilde\theta\in\Theta_*$ and there exists no integer r such that $J(\tilde\theta)=J(\theta)+r$ (in the sense of Theorem 2.3(ii)) then we can represent $Y_1(\theta)=V_1V_2$ and $Y_1(\tilde\theta)=V_2V_3$ where V_1,V_2 and V_3 satisfy conditions of Lemma 4.3 and then (5.8) follows from there. If, say, $\theta\in\Theta\setminus\Theta_*$ then (5.8) still holds true since

$$P\{|Y_1(\theta)|>\rho \text{ and } |Y_1(\tilde\theta)|>\rho\}\le P\{|Y_1(\theta)|>\rho\}$$

taking into account that for $\theta\in\Theta\setminus\Theta_*$ the random variables $Y_1(\theta)$ have faster decaying tail probabilities than for $\theta\in\Theta_*$.

The assertion (iii) follows from (i) and (ii) taking into account properties of weak convergence in the J_1 topology. Namely, regarding weak convergence of finite dimensional distributions of vector processes it is clear that this remains true also for sums of components of vectors. Furthermore, if a sequence of R^d curves converges in the J_1-topology then the corresponding time changes are the same for all d-components, and so the same time changes work also for the sums of components of these curves. □

6. Limit theorem in the arithmetic progression case

Now we turn to the situation where

$$S_N(\theta,t)=\sum_{1\le n\le Nt}Y_n(\theta),\ Y_n(\theta)=g_\theta(X_n,X_{2n},...,X_{\ell n}),\ Y_n=\sum_{\theta\in\Theta}h_\theta Y_n(\theta)$$
$$\text{and } S_N(t)=\sum_{1\le n\le Nt}Y_n=\sum_{1\le n\le Nt}F(X_n,X_{2n},\dots,X_{\ell n}).$$

As in [12] we consider all primes $p_1,\dots,p_s$ in $1,2,\dots,\ell$. Denote by Γ_1 the set of numbers $\{p_1^{b_1}\cdots p_s^{b_s}\}$ with $b_1,\dots,b_s\ge 0$ and arrange them in the increasing order as $1=n_1<n_2<\cdots<n_q<\cdots$. Let $\mathbb{Z}_0$ be the set of all positive integers that do not have $p_1,p_2,\dots,p_s$ as factors. Then any positive integer $n\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ can be written uniquely as a product $n=in_q$ where $i\in\mathbb{Z}_0$ and $n_q\in\Gamma_1$. It is not difficult to see (for instance, by the inclusion-exclusion principle) that the set $\mathbb{Z}_0$ has density $\rho=\Pi_{i=1}^s(1-\frac{1}{p_i})$ as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_+$. For $i\in\mathbb{Z}_0$, we denote by Γ_i the set $\{in\}$ with n from Γ_1. Then Γ_i are disjoint and $\mathbb{Z}_+=\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_0}\Gamma_i$. If $n\in\Gamma_i$ so is rn for $r\le\ell$. In particular Y_m depends only on the variables $\{X_n\}$ with n in the same Γ_i to which m belongs and the collections $\{Y_m:\ m\in\Gamma_i\}$ are mutually independent for different values of i. We need the following fact.

6.1. **Lemma.** *Given ℓ, the set $\mathbb{Z}_+$ of positive integers can be divided into ℓ^2+1 mutually disjoint sets E_i such that if r and s are two different integers in the same E_i then the two sets $\{r,2r,\dots,\ell r\}$ and $\{s,2r,\dots,\ell s\}$ are disjoint. In particular for every i, $\{Y_r:r\in E_i\}$ are mutually independent.*

Proof. Let us construct a graph with $\mathbb{Z}_+$ as vertices. There is an edge connecting r and s, if the two sets $\{r,2r,\dots,\ell r\}$ and $\{s,2s,\dots,\ell s\}$ have a common integer. In other words $is=jr$ for some i,j between 1 and ℓ. For each fixed r the equation $\frac{r}{s}=\frac{i}{j}$ has at most ℓ^2 solutions in i and j. Hence, the vertices of the graph have degree at most ℓ^2. Therefore ℓ^2+1 colors are enough to make sure that no two vertices connected by an edge have the same color. □

6.2. **Lemma.** *Let $T<\infty$ be fixed. For each $q>1$ and N, let $\mathbf{A}_N^q$ be a subset of integers from $[1,NT]$ with density $\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{|\mathbf{A}_N^q|}{NT}=\rho_q$ such that $\rho_q\to 0$ as $q\to\infty$. Then for any $\theta\in\Theta$,*

$$\limsup_{q\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}P\big\{\sup_{0\le t\le T}\frac{1}{b_N}|\sum_{r\in\mathbf{A}_N^q,\,r\le Nt}(Y_r(\theta)-a_N^\theta)|\ge\delta\big\}=0$$

where

$$a_N^\theta=E\big(\frac{b_N^2Y_1(\theta)}{b_N^2+Y_1^2(\theta)}\big).$$

Proof. We can use Lemma 6.1 to split the set $\mathbf{A}_N^q$ into ℓ^2+1 subsets such that when r runs within each subset the random variables $Y_r(\theta)$ are mutually independent. Since it is enough to prove the estimate for each subset, we can assume that $Y_r(\theta)$ are mutually independent for $r\in\mathbf{A}_N^q$. For each $Y_r(\theta)$ with $\theta\in\Theta_*$ we have the tail estimate,

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^{\alpha*}(\ln\rho)^{-k_*}E[W(\frac{Y_r}{T})]=\int W(x)M(dx)$$

where

$$M(dx)=(c_-\mathbf{1}_{x<0}+c_+\mathbf{1}_{x>0})\frac{dx}{|x|^{1+\frac{\alpha}{\alpha_*}}}.$$

Let N_q be the cardinality of $A_N^q \cap [1, NT]$. If N_q stays bounded as $N \to \infty$ then the assertion of the lemma is clear. Suppose that $N_q \to \infty$ as $N \to \infty$. Then relying on standard (functional) stable limit theorems for i.i.d. random variables (see, for instance, [1], [4], [9] and [10]) and properties of the J_1 convergence we conclude that as $N \to \infty$ the quantity $\sup_{0\le t\le T} \frac{1}{b_{N_q}} |\sum_{r\in \mathbf{A}_N^q,\, r\le Nt} (Y_r - a_{N_q})|$ will have a limiting distribution which does not depend on q. Now, the lemma follows from the observation that

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{b_{N_q}}{b_N} = 0.$$

□

For each integer $q \ge 1$ set

$$\Xi_N^q(\theta, t) = \frac{1}{b_N} \sum_{j=1}^{q} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_0,\, in_j\le Nt} (Y_{in_j}(\theta) - a_N^\theta).$$

We will need the following result.

6.3. **Lemma.** *For each fixed $T < \infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} P\{ \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\Xi_N^q(\theta, t) - \Xi_N(\theta, t)| \ge \varepsilon\} = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Proof. Since

$$\Xi_N(\theta, t) = \frac{1}{b_N} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_0,\, in_s\le Nt} (Y_{in_s}(\theta) - a_N^\theta)$$

we can write

$$\Xi_N(\theta, t) - \Xi_N^q(\theta, t) = \frac{1}{b_N} \sum_{s=q+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_0,\, in_s\le Nt} (Y_{in_s}(\theta) - a_N^\theta).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\Xi_N(\theta, t) - \Xi_N^q(\theta, t)| &\le \sup_{1\le n\le NT} |\sum_{s=q+1}^{\infty} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}_0,\, in_s\le n} (Y_{in_s}(\theta) - a_N^\theta)| \\ &= \sup_{1\le n\le NT} \frac{1}{b_N} |\sum_{r\in\mathbf{A}_N^q,\, r\le n} (Y_r(\theta) - a_N^\theta)| \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_N^q$ is the set of integers in $[1, NT]$ that are divisible by some $n_{q'}$ with $q' > q$. The set of such integers in the interval $[1, NT]$ will have a proportion at most $\sum_{q'>q} \frac{1}{n_{q'}} = \epsilon_q \to 0$ as $q \to \infty$ since

$$\sum_q \frac{1}{n_q} = \sum_{b_1,\dots,b_s\ge 0} \frac{1}{p_1^{b_1} \cdots p_s^{b_s}} = \prod_{j=1}^{s} (1 - \frac{1}{p_j})^{-1} = \frac{1}{\rho} < \infty.$$

Now, the result follows from Lemma 6.2. □

We will study first the limiting behavior of Ξ_N^q as $N \to \infty$ in the J_1 topology and then, relying on Lemma 6.3, will let $q \to \infty$ and obtain weak limits of distributions of Ξ_N required in Theorem 2.4. Set $Z_i^{j,\theta} = Y_{in_j}(\theta)$ so that $Y_{in_j} = \sum_\theta Z_i^{j,\theta}$. Recalling the notation $\Theta_* = \{\theta : \alpha(\theta) = \alpha_*, k(\theta) = k_*\}$ from Section 2 we define an equivalence relation in $\Gamma_1 \times \Theta_*$ by declaring $(n_{j_1}, \theta_1) \sim (n_{j_2}, \theta_2)$ if $n_{j_1} J(\theta_1)$ and $n_{j_2} J(\theta_2)$ are identical as subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ (viewing these as products of a scalar and a

vector). The equivalence classes will be denoted by τ and together they form a set $\mathcal{T}$, a quotient of $\Gamma_1 \times \Theta_*$. The joint distribution of the collection $\{Z_i^{j,\theta}\}$ as j and θ vary does not depend on i. Let $\mathcal{D}_q$ be the (finite) set $\{(n_j, \theta) : j \le q, \theta \in \Theta\}$ whose cardinality we denote by m_q. The vector space R^{m_q} can be naturally decomposed as

$$R^{m_q} = \oplus_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} V_\tau \oplus U$$

corresponding to the span of coordinates from the equivalence classes $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ and the span U of the remaining coordinates from $\mathcal{D}_q$.

6.4. **Lemma.** *Let $\mathbf{Z}_q$ be the random m_q-dimensional vector $\{Z_1^{j,\theta}, j \le q, \theta \in \Theta\}$. Then the limit*

$$\lim_{\rho \to \infty} \rho^{-\alpha_*} (\ln \rho)^{k_*} E W\big(\frac{\mathbf{Z}_q}{\rho}\big) = \int_{S^{m_q - 1}} \int_0^\infty W(su) \nu(ds) \frac{du}{u^{1+\alpha *}} \tag{6.3}$$

exists for any bounded continuous function W satisfying (2.2) and for some measure ν on the $(m_q - 1)$-dimensional sphere $S^{m_q - 1}$. Moreover, ν is concentrated on $\cup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \cdots \{0\} \oplus \{0\} \oplus V_\tau \oplus \{0\} \oplus \cdots$.

Proof. In view of (5.4) we can write for any (n_{j_1}, θ_1) and (n_{j_2}, θ_2) with $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta_*$,

$$g_{\theta_i}(X_{n_{j_i}}, X_{2n_{j_i}}, ..., X_{\ell n_{j_i}}) = \big(\prod_{u=1}^{p_*} X_{l_u^{(i)}}^{\sigma_*} \big) f_{\theta_i}(X_{l_{p_*+1}^{(i)}}, ..., X_{l_\ell^{(i)}}),\ i = 1, 2 \tag{6.4}$$

where $n_{j_i} J(\theta_i) = (l_1^{(i)}, ..., l_{p_*}^{(i)})$ while f_{θ_i} is a monomial containing X_{l_v}'s with indexes l_v in $n_{j_i}, 2n_{j_i}, ..., \ell n_{j_i}$ which are different from $l_1^{(i)}, ..., l_{p_*}^{(i)}$ and X_{l_v}'s are rised in f_{θ_i} to powers smaller than σ_*. If $(n_{j_1}, \theta_1) \sim (n_{j_2}, \theta_2)$ then $(l_1^{(1)}, ..., l_{p_*}^{(1)}) = (l_1^{(2)}, ..., l_{p_*}^{(2)})$, and so for (n_j, θ) within one equivalence class we are in circumstances of Lemma 4.2. If (n_{j_1}, θ_1) and (n_{j_2}, θ_2) are in different equivalence classes then $(l_1^{(1)}, ..., l_{p_*}^{(1)}) \ne (l_1^{(2)}, ..., l_{p_*}^{(2)})$ and we can apply Lemma 4.3 with $Y = g_{\theta_1}(X_{n_{j_1}}, X_{2n_{j_1}}, ..., X_{\ell n_{j_1}})$, $Z = g_{\theta_2}(X_{n_{j_2}}, X_{2n_{j_2}}, ..., X_{\ell n_{j_2}})$ and V_2 consisting of the common part of the products $\prod_{u=1}^{p_*} X_{l_u^{(1)}}^{\sigma_*}$ and $\prod_{u=1}^{p_*} X_{l_u^{(2)}}^{\sigma_*}$ while setting $V_2 = 1$ if this common part is empty. Thus, we arrive at the circumstances of Lemma 4.1 and the current lemma follows from there. □

Now, set

$$\hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}(t) = \frac{1}{b_N} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_0,\, i \le Nt} (Z_i^{j,\theta} - a^\theta).$$

It follows from Lemma 6.4 and standard stable limit theorems for sums of i.i.d. (regularly varying) random vectors (see, for instance, [14] and Section 7.2 in [13]) that for each $q < \infty$ as $N \to \infty$ the vector process

$$\hat{\Xi}_N^q(t) = \{\hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}(t),\ j \le q,\ \theta \in \Theta_*\},\ t \in [0, T]$$

weakly converges in the J_1-topology to an α_*-stable vector Lévy process

$$\hat{\Xi}^q(t) = \{\hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(t),\ j \le q,\ \theta \in \Theta_*\},\ t \in [0, T]$$

while for $\theta \in \Theta \setminus \Theta_*$ the components $\hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}$ converge to $\hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta} \equiv 0$. Moreover, we obtain also from the last assertion of Lemma 6.4 that the vector processes $\{\hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta},\ (n_j, \theta) \in \tau\}$ parametrized by $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ are mutually independent.

Define the vector processes

$$\tilde{\Xi}_N^q(t) = \{\hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_j}),\, j \le q,\, \theta \in \Theta_*\},\, t \in [0,T].$$

Since the processes $\hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}$ weakly converge as $N \to \infty$ in J_1-topology to the corresponding processes $\hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta}$ then the processes $\tilde{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}(t) = \hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_j})$ weakly converge as $N \to \infty$ to $\tilde{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(t) = \hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_j})$. Moreover, observe that for a fixed j all processes $\tilde{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}$, $\theta \in \Theta_*$ are obtained from the corresponding processes $\hat{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}$, $\theta \in \Theta_*$ by the same linear time change, and so we can use for them the same change of time functions appearing in the definition of the J_1-convergence. It follows that for each j the whole vector process $\tilde{\Xi}_N^q(j,t) = \{\tilde{\Xi}_N^{j,\theta}(t),\, \theta \in \Theta_*\},\, t \in [0,T]$ converges weakly in the J_1-topology to an α_*-stable Lévy vector process $\tilde{\Xi}^q(j,t) = \{\tilde{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(t),\, \theta \in \Theta_*\},\, t \in [0,T]$.

Next, relying on Corollary 7.2 in Appendix we will prove that as $N \to \infty$ the full vector process $\tilde{\Xi}_N^q(t),\, t \in [0,T]$ weakly converges in the J_1-topology to the vector process

$$\tilde{\Xi}^q(t) = \{\tilde{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(t),\, j \le q,\, \theta \in \Theta_*\},\, t \in [0,T].$$

In order to do this we have to show that with probability one the vector components $\tilde{\Xi}^q(j,t),\, t \in [0,T],\, j \le q$ have no (pairwise) simultaneous jumps. Namely, consider $\tilde{\Xi}^q(i,t)$ and $\tilde{\Xi}^q(j,t)$ for $j > i$. Set $c = \frac{n_j}{n_i}$. For each integer $k \ge 0$ and $t \in [n_j c^k, n_j c^{k+1})$ define new vector processes

$$\Psi_k^q(i,t) = \tilde{\Xi}^q(i,t) - \tilde{\Xi}^q(i,c^{k+1}) \text{ and } \Psi_k^q(j,t) = \tilde{\Xi}^q(j,t) - \tilde{\Xi}^q(j,c^k).$$

Since the limiting vector Lévy process $\hat{\Xi}^q$ has independent increments we obtain that the vector processes $\Psi_k^q(i,t)$ and $\Psi_k^q(j,t)$ are independent Lévy processes when $t \in [n_j c^k, n_j c^{k+1}]$, and so almost surely they cannot have simultaneous jumps. Hence, with probability one the processes $\tilde{\Xi}^q(i,t)$ and $\tilde{\Xi}^q(j,t)$ have no simultaneous jumps when t runs in $[0,T]$.

Now, from the J_1-convergence of the full vector process $\tilde{\Xi}_N^q$ to $\tilde{\Xi}^q$ we obtain also by Corollary 7.2 that the vector process $\Xi_N^q = \sum_{j=1}^q \tilde{\Xi}_N^q(j,\cdot) = \{\Xi_N^q(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta \in \Theta_*\}$ weakly converges in the J_1 topology to the vector process $\Xi^q = \sum_{j=1}^q \tilde{\Xi}^q(j,\cdot) = \{\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta \in \Theta_*\}$ where $\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^q \tilde{\Xi}^{j,\theta}$. It follows from the convergence of vector processes that as $N \to \infty$ the sum process $\xi_N^q(t) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta \Xi_N^q(\theta,t),\, t \in [0,T]$ also converges weakly in the J_1 topology to $\xi^q(t) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta \Xi^q(\theta,t),\, t \in [0,T]$.

Next, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi^q(\theta,t) &= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_j}) \\ &= \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^q \hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_q}) + \sum_{j=1}^{q-1}\sum_{i=1}^{j}(\hat{\Xi}^{i,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_j}) - \Xi^{i,\theta}(\frac{t}{n_{j+1}})). \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Since for each fixed θ the pairs (i,θ) belong for different i's to different equivalence classes and taking into account that each limiting Lévy process $\hat{\Xi}^{j,\theta}$ has independent increments we conclude that the summands in the right hand side of (6.5) are independent. Hence, the process $\Xi^q(\theta,t),\, \theta \in \Theta_*$ is an α_*-stable Lévy process. If all equivalence classes are singletons then the whole limiting vector process $\hat{\Xi}^q$ has independent increments and this remains true for Ξ^q, as well, in view of its construction by taking sums of certain components of $\hat{\Xi}^q$.

It remains to let $q \to \infty$ and to verify properties of corresponding limiting processes. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_N^{q,\theta}$, $\mathcal{L}^{q,\theta}$, $\mathcal{L}_N^q$, $\mathcal{L}^q$, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_N^\theta$ and $\mathcal{L}_N$ the distributions of processes $\Xi_N^q(\theta,\cdot)$, $\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot)$, Ξ_N^q, Ξ^q, $\Xi_N(\theta,\cdot)$ and $\{\Xi_N(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta_*\}$, respectively, on the time interval $[0,T]$. Denote by d the Prokhorov distance (see, for instance, [4] or [10]) on the corresponding space of distributions and observe that convergence in this metric is equivalent here to the weak convergence with respect to the J_1 topology. The above proof yields that for each $\theta\in\Theta$ and $q\ge 1$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N^{q,\theta}, \mathcal{L}^{q,\theta}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N^q, \mathcal{L}^q) = 0. \tag{6.6}$$

It is also clear from the corresponding definitions that for each $\theta\in\Theta$ and $N\ge 1$,

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N^{q,\theta}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_N^\theta) = \lim_{q\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N^q, \mathcal{L}_N) = 0. \tag{6.7}$$

In addition, it follows from Lemma 6.3 that for each $\theta\in\Theta$,

$$\lim_{q\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N^{q,\theta}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_N^\theta) = \lim_{q\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N^q, \mathcal{L}_N) = 0. \tag{6.8}$$

By the triangle inequality for any $q, q'\ge 1$,

$$d(\mathcal{L}^{q,\theta}, \mathcal{L}^{q',\theta}) \le d(\mathcal{L}^{q,\theta}, \mathcal{L}_N^{q,\theta}) + d(\mathcal{L}_N^{q,\theta}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_N^\theta) + d(\mathcal{L}_N^{q',\theta}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_N^\theta) + d(\mathcal{L}^{q',\theta}, \mathcal{L}_N^{q',\theta})$$

and

$$d(\mathcal{L}^q, \mathcal{L}^{q'}) \le d(\mathcal{L}^q, \mathcal{L}_N^q) + d(\mathcal{L}_N^q, \mathcal{L}_N) + d(\mathcal{L}_N^{q'}, \mathcal{L}_N) + d(\mathcal{L}^{q'}, \mathcal{L}_N^{q'}).$$

These together with (6.6)–(6.8) yields that

$$\lim_{q,q'\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}^{q,\theta}, \mathcal{L}^{q',\theta}) = \lim_{q,q'\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}^q, \mathcal{L}^{q'}) = 0. \tag{6.9}$$

Hence, $\{\mathcal{L}^{q,\theta},\, q\ge 1\}$ and $\{\mathcal{L}^q,\, q\ge 1\}$ are Cauchy sequences in the corresponding complete metric spaces, and so there exist distributions $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta$ and $\mathcal{L}$ on the corresponding spaces such that

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}^{q,\theta}, \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta) = \lim_{q\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}^q, \mathcal{L}) = 0. \tag{6.10}$$

It follows also from (6.6)–(6.8) that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} d(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_N^\theta, \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta) = \lim_{N\to\infty} d(\mathcal{L}_N, \mathcal{L}) = 0. \tag{6.11}$$

Let also $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N^q$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^q$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ be distributions of the sum processes $\xi_N^q(\cdot) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta \Xi_N^q(\theta,\cdot)$, $\xi^q(\cdot) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta \Xi^q(\theta,\cdot)$ and $\xi_N(\cdot) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta \Xi_N(\theta,\cdot)$, respectively. Then, in the same way as above we obtain that there exists a distribution $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ such that

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} d(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^q, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} d(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}) = 0. \tag{6.12}$$

Let $\Xi(\theta,\cdot)$, $\{\Xi(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta_*\}$ and ξ be the processes on the time interval $[0,T]$ having the distributions $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\theta$, $\mathcal{L}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$, respectively. Thus, we established the following weak convergencies in the J_1 topology as $N\to\infty$,

$$\Xi_N(\theta,\cdot) \Rightarrow \Xi(\theta,\cdot),\ \{\Xi_N(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta_*\} \Rightarrow \{\Xi(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta_*\} \text{ and } \xi_N \Rightarrow \xi.$$

Observe that from convergence of the vector process above it follows that $\xi(\cdot) = \sum_{\theta\in\Theta} h_\theta \Xi(\theta,\cdot)$.

Since for each q the processes $\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot)$, $\{\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot),\, \theta\in\Theta_*\}$ and ξ^q have α^*-stable distributions we derive from convergence as $q\to\infty$ of characteristic functions of marginal and finite dimensional distributions of these processes that the limiting

processes $\Xi(\theta,\cdot)$, $\{\Xi(\theta,\cdot),\ \theta\in\Theta_*\}$ and ξ must have α^*-stable distributions, as well. Under the conditions of Theorem 2.4(ii) for each q the processes $\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot)$, $\{\Xi^q(\theta,\cdot),\ \theta\in\Theta_*\}$ and ξ^q have independent increments and, again, in view of convergence of characteristic functions we see that the limiting as $q\to\infty$ processes $\Xi(\theta,\cdot)$, $\{\Xi(\theta,\cdot),\ \theta\in\Theta_*\}$ and ξ have independent increments, as well, i.e. they are Lévy processes, completing the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

7. Appendix

We will start here with a basic property of the J_1-convergence. Let X and Y be two Polish spaces and $D([0,1];X)$ and $D([0,1];Y)$ are spaces of X valued and Y valued functions that are right continuous, have left limits at every $t\in[0,1]$ and are, in addition, left continuous at 1. In general, if $x_n(\cdot)\in D([0,1];X)$ and $y_n(\cdot)\in D([0,1];Y)$ converge in J_1 topology respectively to $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ then it does not follow that $z_n(\cdot)=(x_n(\cdot),y_n(\cdot))$ converges to $z(\cdot)=(x(\cdot),y(\cdot))\in D([0,1];Z)$ where $Z=X\times Y$. It is possible that $x_n(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ have jumps at two distinct points t_n,t_n' that tend to a common point t. As functions with values in $Z=X\times Y$, $z_n(t)$ has two jumps that come together and this rules out convergence in $D([0,1];Z)$. However we have the following

7.1. **Lemma.** *Let $x_n(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ converge in J_1 topology to $x(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$ respectively in $D([0,1];X)$ and $D([0,1];Y)$. Let $x(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$ do not have a jump at the same t, i.e the sets of discontinuity points of $x(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$ are disjoint. Then $z_n(\cdot)=(x_n(\cdot),y_n(\cdot))$ converges in J_1 topology to $z(\cdot)=(x(\cdot),y(\cdot))$ in $D([0,1];Z)$ where $Z=X\times Y$. In particular if $f:Z\to S$ is a continuous map then $f(x_n(\cdot),y_n(\cdot))$ converges in the J_1 topology to $f((x(\cdot),y(\cdot))\in D([0,1];S)$.*

Proof. Since $x_n(t)$ and $y_n(t)$ converge in the J_1 topologies on X and Y, respectively, there are compact sets K_X and K_Y in X and Y such that $x_n(t)\in K_X$, and $y_n(t)\in K_Y$ for all n and $t\in[0,1]$. Therefore $z_n(t)\in K=K_X\times K_Y$ for all n and $t\in[0,1]$. We need to control uniformly the $D[0,1]$ modulus of continuity $\omega_h(z_n(\cdot))$ of $z_n(t)=(x_n(t),y_n(t))$ where

$$\omega_h(z(\cdot))=\sup_{t_1,t_2:|t_1-t_2|\le h}\inf_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(z(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(z(\cdot))]$$

and

$$\Delta_{(a,b)}(z(\cdot))=\sup_{t,s\in(a,b)}d(z(t),z(s))$$

is the oscillation of $z(\cdot)$ in the interval (a,b). We can take $d(z_1,z_2)=d_1(x_1,x_2)+d_2(y_1,y_2)$ where d,d_1,d_2 are the metrics in Z,X,Y respectively. Then with the obvious definitions of $\Delta_{(a,b)}(x(\cdot))$ and $\Delta_{(a,b)}(y(\cdot))$,

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_h(z(\cdot))\le&\sup_{t_1,t_2:|t_1-t_2|\le h}\inf_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(x(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(x(\cdot))]\\&+\sup_{t_1,t_2:|t_1-t_2|\le h}\sup_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(y(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(y(\cdot))].\end{aligned}$$

The convergence of $x_n(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ in the corresponding J_1 topologies guarantees that

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Big[\sup_{t_1,t_2:|t_1-t_2|\le h}\inf_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(x_n(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(x_n(\cdot))]$$
$$+\sup_{t_1,t_2:|t_1-t_2|\le h}\inf_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(y_n(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(y_n(\cdot))]\Big]=0.$$

Since the jumps of $x_n(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ converge individually to the jumps of $x(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$ while $x(\cdot)$ and $y(\cdot)$ do not have any common jumps, for any $\epsilon>0$ there is a $\delta>0$ such that all the jumps of $x_n(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ of size at least $\epsilon>0$ are uniformly separated from one another by some $\delta=\delta(\epsilon)>0$. We can now estimate the $D[0,1]$ modulus continuity of $z_n(\cdot)$. If $h<\delta$ any interval of length h will have at most one jump of size larger than ϵ. Therefore of the two components $x_n(\cdot)$ and $y_n(\cdot)$ only one of them can have a jump larger than ϵ. If $y_n(t)$ does not have a jump of size larger than ϵ in (t_1,t_2) and $|t_2-t_1|<h$ then

$$\sup_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(y_n(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(y_n(\cdot))]\le\Delta_{(t_1,t_2)}(y_n(\cdot))$$
$$\le 2\inf_{\tau\in(t_1,t_2)}\max[\Delta_{(t_1,\tau)}(y_n(\cdot)),\Delta_{(\tau,t_2)}(y_n(\cdot))]+\epsilon$$

Therefore

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\omega_h(z_n(\cdot))=0$$

and we are done. □

7.2. **Corollary.** *(i) If x_n^i converge to x^i, $i=1,...,d$ in the J_1 topology on $D([0,1];X_i)$, where X_i are Polish spaces, and for any pair $i\ne j$ the limits x^i and x^j have no common jumps, i.e the discontinuity points $U_l=\{t:x^l(t-0)\ne x^l(t\}$ for $l=i$ and $l=j$ are disjoint, then as $n\to\infty$ the d-vector functions $\{x_n^i,\,i=1,...,d\}$ converge to $\{x^i,\,i=1,...,d\}$ in the J_1 topology of the product space $D([0,1];\prod_{i=1}^d X_i)$.*

(ii) Let x_n^i and x^i satisfy conditions of (i) with $X_i=R^q$, $i=1,...,d$ for some integer $q\ge 1$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^d x_n^i$ converges in the J_1 topology of $D([0,1];R^q)$ to $\sum_{i=1}^d x^i$.

(iii) Let $\{P_n,\,n\ge 1\}$ be probability measures on $D([0,1];\prod_{i=1}^d X_i)$, where $X_i, i=1,...,d$ are the same as in (i), and suppose that the marginals on $D([0,1];X_i)$, $i=1,...,d$ of P_n's converge weakly with respect to the J_1 topology while the joint finite dimensional distributions of P_n converge on $D([0,1];\prod_{i=1}^d X_i)$ to a limit P. If P almost surely the components of d-vector functions $(x_1(t),...,x_d(t))$ have no common jumps pairwise then P_n weakly converges to P as $n\to\infty$ in the J_1 topology.

While considering real valued random variables in the domain of attraction of a stable law it is natural to consider tail behavior of the form

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}T^\alpha(\ln T)^{-k}P[\pm X\ge T]=c_\pm. \tag{7.1}$$

If X is R^d valued then a tail behavior similar to the one dimensional case above will be to require that for every continuous function f on the unit sphere S^{d-1} the limit

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}E\big[\mathbf{1}_{|X|\ge\rho}f\big(\frac{X}{|X|}\big)\big]=\int_{S^{d-1}}f(s)\nu(ds) \tag{7.2}$$

exists where ν is a finite nonnegative measure on S^{d-1}. To make the connection we need only to think of S^0 as ± 1 and $\nu(\{\pm 1\}) = c^{\pm}$. The following result essentially coincides with Theorem 3.6 of [13] but for readers' convenience we provide its proof here.

7.3. **Lemma.** *The relation (7.2) holds true for every bounded continuous f on S^{d-1} if and only if*

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\frac{X}{\rho})] = \int_{S^{d-1}} \int_0^{\infty} W(sr) \frac{\alpha\nu(ds)\, dr}{r^{1+\alpha}} \tag{7.3}$$

for every W from the space $\mathcal{W}$ of bounded continuous functions satisfying (2.2).

Proof. In (7.2) we can replace ρ by ρz with $z > 0$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E\big[\mathbf{1}_{\frac{|X|}{\rho}\ge z} f\big(\frac{X}{|X|}\big)\big] &= \frac{1}{z^{\alpha}} \int_{S^{d-1}} f(s)\nu(ds) \\ &= \int_{S^{d-1}} f(s)\nu(ds) \int_z^{\infty} \frac{\alpha}{u^{1+\alpha}} du \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

It is now easy to conclude that if $V(r,s)$ is a continuous function of $r > 0$ and $s \in S^{d-1}$ and for some $\delta > 0$ it is identically 0 if $r \le \delta$ then

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E\big[V(\frac{|X|}{\rho}, \frac{X}{|X|})\big] = \int_0^{\infty} \int_{S^{d-1}} V(u,s)\nu(ds) \frac{\alpha}{u^{1+\alpha}} du. \tag{7.5}$$

We now take $V(r,s) = W(rs)$ and obtain (7.3). To control the contribution near 0 for $W \in \mathcal{W}$ we denote by $R(x)$ the tail probability $P[|X| \ge x]$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[W(\tfrac{X}{\rho})\mathbf{1}_{\frac{|X|}{\rho}\le\delta}] \le C\rho^{\alpha}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[(\tfrac{X^2}{\rho^2})\mathbf{1}_{\frac{|X|}{\rho}|\le\delta}] \\ = C\rho^{\alpha-2}(\ln\rho)^{-k} E[X^2\mathbf{1}_{|X|\le\delta T}] = -CT^{\alpha-2}(\ln T)^{-k} \textstyle\int_0^{\delta\rho} x^2 dR(x) \\ \le C\rho^{\alpha-2}(\ln\rho)^{-k} \textstyle\int_0^{\delta\rho} 2\,x\,R(x)\,dx \\ \le C\rho^{\alpha-2}(\ln\rho)^{-k} \textstyle\int_0^{\delta\rho} x(1+x)^{-\alpha}(\ln(2+x))^k dx \le C\delta^{2-\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

is uniformly controlled because $\alpha < 2$. Finally to go from (7.3) to (7.2), we take $W(x) = \mathbf{1}_{[1,\infty]}(x) f(\frac{x}{|x|})$ which can be justified by approximating $\mathbf{1}_{[1,\infty]}$ by continuous functions. □

7.4. **Remark.** Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of independent and identically distributed random vectors in R^d that satisfy (7.3). Let

$$S_N(t) = \sum_{1\le n\le Nt} X_n$$

and

$$\Xi_N(t) = \frac{1}{b_N}[S_N(t) - Nta_N] \tag{7.6}$$

where the normalizer b_N is given by

$$b_N = N^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} (\frac{\ln N}{\alpha})^{\frac{k}{\alpha}}$$

and the centering a_N is given by

$$a_N = E\big[\frac{b_N^2 X_1}{b_N^2 + |X_1|^2}\big].$$

Then, according to standard limit theorems for sums of independent random vectors (see, for instance, [14] and Section 7.2 in [13]), the processes $\Xi_N(t)$ converge in the Skorokhod J_1 topology on $D[[0,T];R^d]$ to a limiting stable process Ξ with the characteristic function of the increments $\Xi(t)-\Xi(s)$ given by

$$E[e^{i<\xi,\Xi(t)-\Xi(s)>}]=\exp[(t-s)\psi(\xi)] \tag{7.7}$$

where

$$\psi(\xi)=\int_{R^d\setminus\{0\}}[e^{i<\xi,y>}-1-\frac{i<\xi,y>}{1+|y|^2}]\mu(dy)$$
$$=\int_{S^{d-1}}\int_0^\infty[e^{i<\xi,sr>}-1-\frac{i<\xi,sr>}{1+|r|^2}]\frac{\nu(ds)dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}$$

It follows that if ν is concentrated on axes then components of the process $X(t)$ are independent. The proof relies on the calculation

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}N\ln[E[e^{i<\xi,X'_N>}]]=\psi(\xi)$$

where $X'_N=\frac{1}{b_N}[X_1-a_N]$.

7.5. **Remark.** The basic assumptions involved in proving the convergence to the stable process with independent increments is independence of the random variables, a common distribution with the correct tail behavior that puts them in the domain of attraction of the stable distribution with Lévy measure $\frac{\nu(ds)dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}$ on R^d. It is possible that we have a random vector in which two components are not independent but in the limiting distribution they become independent. If the Lévy measure is $\frac{\nu(ds)dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}$, then for R^d to split as a sum $\oplus V_j$ with components of the random vector corresponding to different V_j being mutually independent it is necessary and sufficient that ν is supported on the union of the subspaces V_j. In other words $\nu[|x_j|>0,|x_{j'}|>0]=0$ where $x=\sum x_j$ is the natural decomposition of x into components from $\{V_j\}$. This requires that

$$\lim_{\rho\to\infty}\rho^\alpha(\ln\rho)^{-k}P\{|X_{1j}|>\rho,|X_{1j'}|>\rho\}=0$$

for any $j\neq j'$ where $X_1=(X_{11},X_{12},...,X_{1d})$ and X_1 is the same as in Remark 7.4.

7.6. **Remark.** Let $\{X_n\}$ be as in Remark 7.4 and T be a linear map $R^d\to R^m$. Then the process

$$Y_N(t)=T\Xi_N(t)=\sum_{1\le n\le Nt}\frac{1}{b_N}(TX_n-Ta_N)$$

will, after normalization, converge to $Y(t)=T\Xi(t)$, a process with independent increments given by

$$E[e^{i<\xi',Y(t)-Y(s)>}]=\exp[(t-s)[i<\gamma,\xi'>+\psi'(\xi')]]$$

where

$$\psi'(\xi')=\int_{R^m\setminus\{0\}}[e^{i<\xi',s'r>}-1-\frac{i<\xi',sr>}{1+|r|^2}]\frac{\nu'(ds')dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}$$

and

$$\gamma'=\int_{R^d}\left[\frac{T(sr)}{1+|T(sr)|^2}-\frac{T(sr)}{1+|r|^2}\right]\frac{\nu(ds)dr}{r^{1+\alpha}}.$$

The amount by which the process needs centering is only unique up to a constant and this requires us to make the adjustment with the term $\gamma' t$ which is the difference

between two possibly infinite terms. It is not hard to see that as $N \to \infty$, $b_N \to \infty$ and by the bounded convergence theorem, $\frac{a_N}{b_N} \to 0$.

In Section 5 we proved convergence of the finite dimensional distributions to a stable Lévy process, by appealing to [16]. This required a rearrangement of the monomial terms, that make up the polynomial. The new process converged in J_1 topology. If condition (7.13) below were satisfied then the rearrangement was not needed and the original process converged in the J_1 topology. We provide here an alternate proof that does not require this modification, but yields directly finite dimensional convergence for stationary ℓ dependent sums as well as convergence in J_1 topology under the additional assumption (7.13).

Let H be a finite dimensional Euclidean space and $\{X_i,\, i \geq 1\}$ be a stationary sequence of H valued random variables that are ℓ-dependent and have regularly varying heavy tails with an index $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and a Lévy measure M, i.e. (7.2) holds true with $X = X_1$ and $\nu = M$. We will assume that for $d = 2\ell - 1$ and all $f \in \mathcal{W}(H^d)$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} NE[f(\frac{X_1}{b_N}, \ldots, \frac{X_d}{b_N})] = \int_{H^d} f(x_1, \ldots, x_d) M^d(dx). \tag{7.8}$$

Observe that when the stationary ℓ-dependent sequence of random vectors above is obtained in the framework of Theorem 2.3 then relying on Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.4 we see that the condition (7.8) is automatically satisfied.

7.7. **Lemma.** *Suppose that (7.8) holds true. Then for any integer $k \geq 1$ the limit*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} NE[f(\frac{X_1}{b_N}, \ldots, \frac{X_k}{b_N})] = \int_{H^d} f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) M^k(dx) \tag{7.9}$$

exists and M^k can be computed from M^d.

Proof. If for $k > d$ the limits do not exist then because of stationarity we can always select a subsequence such that the limits exist for all values of k and $f \in \mathcal{W}(H^k)$ and we will continue to denote corresponding limiting measures by M^k. If we can recover M^k from M^d, then all subsequences will have the same limit and hence the limit as $N \to \infty$ will exist. For $-\infty < a \leq b < \infty$ with $b - a \leq 2\ell - 2$, $J = \{i : a \leq i \leq b\}$ will be of size at most $2\ell - 1$ and the limits M^J on H^J will exist and be translation invariant. For any partition of J into disjoint subsets A and B we can write $H^J \backslash \{0\}$ as the disjoint union

$$H^J \backslash \{0\} = \cup_{A \in \mathcal{A}(J)} H^J_A$$

where $\mathcal{A}(J) = \{A :\, (A,B) \in \mathcal{P}(J)\}$ and $\mathcal{P}(J)$ is the set of partitions with nonempty A and

$$H^J_A = \{x \in H^J : x_i \neq 0 \ \forall\ i \in A;\ x_i = 0 \ \forall i \in B\}.$$

We can write $M^J = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}(J)} M^J_A$, where M^J_A is the restriction of M^J to H^J_A. By the ℓ dependence we obtain that if $|i - j| \geq \ell$ then for any $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} NP[|X_i| \geq \delta b_N, |X_j| \geq \delta b_N] = 0$$

which in turn implies that $M^J[x_i \neq 0, x_j \neq 0] = 0$ whenever $i, j \in J$ and $|i - j| \geq \ell$. Any set $A \in \mathcal{A}(J)$ can be ordered $a_1 < a_2 < \ldots a_r$ and integers r, and $\sigma_i = a_{i+1} - a_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$ determine A up to a translation. Set $sp(A) = 1 + \sigma_1 + \cdots + \sigma_r = a_r - a_1 + 1$. Then $M^J_A = 0$ unless $sp(A) \leq \ell$. For any A consider the extended

interval $\widehat{A} = \{a_r - \ell + 1 \le i \le a_1 + \ell - 1\}$. It is the set of integers j such that $|j - i| \le \ell - 1$ for all $i \in A$. In particular M_A^J is determined by $M_A^{\widehat{A}}$ if $J \supset \widehat{A}$. We write

$$M^J = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}(J)} M_A^J = \sum_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{A}(J) \\ \widehat{A} \subset J}} M_A^J + \sum_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{A}(J) \\ \widehat{A} \not\subset J}} M_A^J.$$

Since M^J determines M_A^J it determines also $M_A^{\widehat{A}}$ if $\widehat{A} \subset J$. If $\widehat{A} \not\subset J$ we can replace J by $I = J \cup \widehat{A}$ and

$$M_A^J = \sum_{B \supset A} M_B^I = \sum_{B \supset A} M_B^{\widehat{B}}$$

Clearly, $M_B^{\widehat{B}} = 0$ unless $sp(B) \le \ell$ and so $sp(\widehat{B}) \le 2\ell - 1$. By translation invariance all these measures are determined by $M^{2\ell-1}$. □

Sets with $sp(A) \le \ell$ can be characterized by r and $a_1 < a_2 \ldots < a_r$ with $a_r - a_1 \le \ell - 1$ and up to a translation by r and $\sigma_i \ge 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \sigma_i \le 1$. We map $H^{\widehat{A}}$ into H by $x = \sum_{i \in \widehat{A}} x_i$ and the push forward of the measure $M_A^{\widehat{A}}$ is denoted by $M^{r,\{\sigma_i\}}$ on H. Let

$$M^* = \sum_{r, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r} M^{r,\{\sigma_i\}}. \tag{7.10}$$

For each $r, \{\sigma_i\}$ we set

$$\gamma_{r,\{\sigma_i\}} = \int_{H^{\widehat{A}}} \Big[\frac{\sum_{i \in A} x_i}{1 + |\sum_{i \in A} x_i|^2} - \sum_{i \in A} \frac{x_i}{1 + |x_i|^2}\Big] M_A^{\widehat{A}}(dx)$$

and let

$$\gamma = \sum_{r, \{\sigma_i\}} \gamma_{r,\{\sigma_i\}}.$$

We note that $\gamma_{1,\{\sigma_i\}} = 0$ because A contains only one integer.

7.8. **Theorem.** *Under the condition (7.8) the finite dimensional distributions of the process*

$$\xi_N(t) = \sum_{1 \le i \le Nt} \frac{1}{b_N}[X_i - a_N] \tag{7.11}$$

converge weakly to those of a stable process with the logarithm of its characteristic function at time t given by

$$\log \psi_t(u) = it\langle \gamma, u \rangle + t \int_H [e^{i\langle u, x \rangle} - 1 - \frac{i\langle u, x \rangle}{1 + \|x\|^2}] M^*(dx) \tag{7.12}$$

where M^* is computed from M^d as in (7.10). In addition, if for all $i \ne j$

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} NP[|X_i| \ge \delta b_N, |X_j| \ge \delta b_N] = 0 \tag{7.13}$$

then there is no need in the assumption (7.8) as (7.9) automatically holds true for any integer $k \ge 1$ and the weak convergence as $N \to \infty$ of the processes ξ_N takes place in the J_1 topology. Furthermore, in the latter case $M^* = M$.

Note that since $\frac{a_N}{b_N} \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$, (7.13) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} NP[|X_i - a_N| \ge \delta b_N, |X_j - a_N| \ge \delta b_N] = 0$$

Proof. Let k be an integer that will eventually get large. To exploit ℓ dependence we want to sum over blocks of size k and leave gaps of size $\ell-1$. We divide the set of positive integers into blocks of size $k+\ell-1$. $B(r)=\{i:(r-1)(k+\ell-1)+1\le i\le (r-1)(k+\ell-1)\}$. Each $B(r)$ consists of the initial segment $B^+(r)$ of length k and the gap $B^-(r)$ of size $\ell-1$. $Z^+=\cup_r B^+(r)$ and $Z^-(r)=\cup_r B^-(r)$. We define

$$\xi_N^k(t)=\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le Nt\\ i\in Z^+}}[X_i-a_N]$$

and

$$\eta_N^k(t)=\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{\substack{1\le i\le Nt\\ i\in Z^-}}[X_i-a_N]$$

so that $\xi_N(t)=\xi_N^k(t)+\eta_N^k(t)$. It follows from Lemma 6.2 considered with X_i's in place of $Y_i(\theta)$'s (as the proof in this lemma does not rely on a specific monomial form of summands there) that for any $\epsilon>0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\limsup_{N\to\infty}P[\sup_{0\le t\le T}|\eta_N^k(t)|\ge\epsilon]=0 \tag{7.14}$$

It is enough to show that for fixed k the limit theorem is valid for $\xi_N^k(t)$ as $N\to\infty$. We can then let $k\to\infty$ similarly to the end of Section 6. We denote the block sums by $Y_i=\sum_{j\in B^+(i)}X_j$ and observe that $Y_1,Y_2,...$ are i.i.d. by the ℓ-dependence and stationarity. Then

$$\xi_N^k(t)=\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{j:j(k+\ell-1)\le Nt}[Y_j-ka_N]+\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{i\in I(t)}[X_i-a_N]=\zeta_N^k(t)+R_N^k(t) \tag{7.15}$$

where $I(t)$ is an incomplete block at the end. If we want to show convergence of finite dimensional distributions to the Lévy process given by (7.10) we need to show that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{N}{k}E[f(\frac{X_1+\cdots+X_k}{b_N})]=\int_H f(x)M^*(dx).$$

In order to complete the proof of finite dimensional convergence we need to check only that for each fixed t the second term in (7.15) is negligible in probability. Since k is fixed and $N\to\infty$ this is obvious. The tails behavior of $\frac{X_1+\cdots+X_k}{b_N}$ is given by the image of M^k by the map $x_1+x_2+\cdots+x_k\to x$ of $H^k\to H$. Since $M^k=\sum_A M_A^k$ and they are 0 unless $sp(A)\le\ell$, averaging over translations of A, ignoring a few terms at the ends, produces as $k\to\infty$, M^* for the Lévy measure. The effect of the gap is a factor of $\frac{k}{k+\ell-1}$ that multiplies M^* which tends to 1 as $k\to\infty$. Any partial block consists of a sum of at most k terms of $\frac{X_i}{b_N}$ and is negligible for large N. So is $\frac{a_N}{b_N}$.

Next, we need to verify the centering. We use the truncated mean $\frac{x}{1+|x|^2}$ which then appears in the representation as a counter term in the integrand

$$\int\big[e^{i<\xi,x>}-1-\sum_j\frac{i\,\xi_j\,x_j}{1+|x_j|^2}\big]M_A^{\widehat{A}}(dx) \tag{7.16}$$

But when we push forward the measure $M^{\widehat{A}}$ from $H^{\widehat{A}} \to H$ by taking the sum $y = \sum_{i\in A} x_i$ we end up with

$$\int \big[e^{i\,\xi\,y} - 1 - \frac{i\,\xi\,y}{1+|y|^2}\big] M^{r,\{\sigma_i\}}(dy)$$
$$= \int \big[e^{i\,\xi\,y} - 1 - \frac{i\,\xi\,\sum_i x_i}{1+|\sum_i x_i|^2}\big] M_A^{\widehat{A}}(dx) \tag{7.17}$$

The difference between the two counter terms in (7.16) and (7.17) is $\gamma_{r,\{\sigma_i\}}$ and it adds up to

$$\gamma = \sum_{r,\{\sigma_i\}} \gamma_{r,\{\sigma_i\}}$$

which appears outside of the integral in (7.12) and does not influence the limiting measure M^*.

Now, if the condition (7.13) is satisfied then convergence in the J_1 topology follows from Proposition 5.1 obtained in [16] as a corollary of a more general result but we will still give an alternative direct proof below. Since convergence of finite dimensional distributions was already obtained above it remains to establish tightness of the processes ξ_N^k, $N \geq 1$ and the conclusion of the proof is similar to Section 6 by letting $k \to \infty$. Observe though that the convergence of finite dimensional distributions was established above under the condition (7.8) while we claim that (7.13) already implies (7.8), and so we discuss this issue first.

Set $m = \dim H$ and let $Z_i = (X_j,\, j \in B^+(i))$ be mk-dimensional random vectors whose m-dimensional components are X_j's and their sum amounts to Y_i. The random vectors Z_i, $i = 1, 2, ...$ are i.i.d. and in view of (7.13) we conclude by Lemma 4.1 that they have regularly varying tails and, in particular, that (7.8) holds true. Thus by [14] (or by Section 7.2 in [13]) the vector process

$$\Psi_N^k(t) = \frac{1}{b_N} \sum_{i:\, i(k+\ell-1)\leq Nt} \big(X_j - a_N,\, j \in B^+(i)\big)$$

converges weakly in the J_1 topology as $N \to \infty$ to a vector Lévy process. Considering the linear map $(x_1, ..., x_k) \longrightarrow x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ of H^k to H we see by Remark 7.6 that

$$\zeta_N^k(t) = \frac{1}{b_N} \sum_{i:\, i(k+\ell-)\leq Nt} (Y_i - k a_N)$$

also converges weakly in the J_1 topology as $N \to \infty$ to a corresponding Lévy process which implies also tightness of the sequence of processes $\{\zeta_N^k,\, N \geq 1\}$.

Now, we just need to make sure that the summation that has been carried out over blocks $Y = X_1 + \cdots + X_k$ will still allow us to derive tightness in the J_1 topology of the processes ξ_N^k which amounts to boundedness and modulus of continuity estimates (see, for instance, [10], Theorem 3.21 in Ch.VI). The J_1 tightness of processes $\{\zeta_N^k,\, N \geq 1\}$ explained above yields estimates of $D[0,T]$ modulus of continuity of these processes in the following form.

For any $\epsilon > 0, \eta > 0$, there is a $\theta > 0$ and a set $\Delta(N, \theta, \epsilon)$ such that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} P[\Delta(N, \theta, \epsilon)] < \eta$$

and on the complement $[\Delta(N,\theta,\epsilon)]^c$, given any u, v with $|u-v|<\theta$, either

$$\sup_{\frac{Nu}{k_\ell}\le j\le\frac{Nv}{k_\ell}} |\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{\frac{Nu}{k_\ell}\le r\le j}(Y_r - ka_N)| < \epsilon \tag{7.18}$$

or there is an integer q such that $Nu \le q \le Nv$ and both

$$\sup_{\frac{Nu}{k_\ell}\le j\le q-1} |\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{\frac{Nu}{k_\ell}\le r\le j}(Y_r - ka_N)| < \epsilon \tag{7.19}$$

and

$$\sup_{q+1\le j\le\frac{Nv}{k_\ell}} |\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{q+1\le r\le j}(Y_r - ka_N)| < \epsilon \tag{7.20}$$

where for brevity we set $k_\ell = k+\ell-1$. We need a similar estimate for $\xi_N^k(t)$ the process of partial sums of $\{\frac{1}{b_N}[X_i - a_N]\}$. From (7.13), we can assume that for any $\eta>0, \delta>0$, there is a $\theta>0$ such that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} P[F(N,\theta,\delta)] < \eta$$

where

$$F(N,\theta,\delta) = \cup_{i,j:|i-j|\le N\theta}\{||X_i - a_N] \ge \delta b_N \ \&\ |X_j - a_N| \ge \delta b_N\}.$$

Suppose $Y = X_1 + \cdots X_k$ is the sum over a block. On $[F_{N,\theta,\delta}]^c$, if some $|X_i - a_N| \ge \delta b_N$, then $|X_j - a_N| \le \delta b_N$ for $j \ne i$ and therefore

$$|X_i - a_N| \le |Y - ka_N| + \sum_{j:j\ne i}|X_j - a_N| \le |Y - ka_N| + (k-1)\delta b_N$$

In particular, if $|Y - ka_N| \le \epsilon b_N$ then $\sup_{1\le i\le k}|X_i - a_N| \le ((k-1)\delta+\epsilon)b_N$. On the other hand, if $|Y - ka_N| \ge \epsilon b_N$ then $|X_i - a_N| \ge \frac{\epsilon}{k} b_N$ for some i. If $\delta \le \frac{\epsilon}{k}$ then $|X_i - a_N| \ge \delta b_N$ and on $[F(N,\theta,\delta)]^c$, for $j\ne i$, $|X_j - a_N| \le \delta b_N$.

Now we can estimate the $D[0,T]$ modulus of continuity of the ξ_N^k process. Let θ be small enough and $|i-j| < N\theta$. Then there are blocks $B^+(r_i)$ and $B^+(r_j)$ to which i and j belong. We consider the rescaled partial sums of the process Y_r in the interval $r_i \le r \le r_j$. We restrict ourselves to the set $[\Delta(N,\theta,\epsilon)]^c$. Suppose the alternative (7.18) holds. In particular $|Y_r - ka_N| \le \epsilon b_N$ for every r in the range. Any X_q belonging to any of the blocks will satisfy $\frac{1}{b_N}|X_q - a_N| \le (\epsilon + (k-1)\delta)$. Therefore the analog of (7.18) holds and

$$\sup_{i\le q\le j} |\frac{1}{b_N}\sum_{i\le r\le q}(X_q - a_N)| < \epsilon + k(\epsilon + (k-1)\delta) = f_k(\epsilon,\delta) \tag{7.21}$$

which goes to 0 with ϵ and δ.

Suppose the alternatives (7.19) and (7.20) hold. This provides us a block $B^+(q)$. Suppose $\frac{1}{b_N}|Y_q - ka_N| < \epsilon$ we are in the previous situation of (7.18) with 3ϵ replacing ϵ. If $\frac{1}{b_N}|Y_q - ka_N| > \epsilon$ and $\delta < \frac{\epsilon}{k}$, there is a q' in the block with $\frac{1}{b_N}|X'_q - a_N| \ge \delta b_N$. On $[F(N,\theta,\delta)]^c$, for any $q'' \ne q'$ in $B^+(q)$, $\frac{1}{b_N}|X''_q - a_N| \le \delta b_N$, and combined with (7.19) and (7.20) this proved the modulus of continuity estimate for the process $\xi_N^k(\cdot)$ in the J_1 topology. Now the tightness follows (see Theorem 3.21, Ch.VI in [10]) since we obtain also uniform boundedness in probability of processes ξ_N^k from the corresponding result for normalized sums ζ_N^k of independent blocks together with the above estimates.

As mentioned above, letting $k \to \infty$ similarly to the end of Section 6 we obtain weak convergence in the J_1 topology of processes ξ_N to a Lévy process with the measure M^*. Finally, we observe that under the condition (7.13) the right hand side of (7.10) contains only $r = 1$, and so $M^* = M$, completing the proof. □

References

[1] A. Araujo and E. Giné, *The Central Limit Theorem for Real and Banach Valued Random Variables*, Wiley, New York, 1980.

[2] F. Avram and M.S. Taqqu, *Weak convergence of sums of moving averages in the α-stable domain of attraction*, Ann. Probab. 20(1992), 483–503.

[3] P. Billingsley, *Probability and Measure*, Wiley, New York, 1986.

[4] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, 2nd ed. Wiley, New York, 1999.

[5] R.A. Davis, *Stable limits for partial sums of dependent random variables*, Ann. Probab. 11 (1983), 262–269.

[6] M. Denker and A. Jakubowski, *Stable distributions for strongly mixing sequences*, Stat. Prob. Letters 8 (1989), 477-483.

[7] R. Durrett and S.I. Resnick, *Functional limit theorems for dependent variables*, Ann. Probab. 6 (1978), 829–846.

[8] H. Furstenberg, *Nonconventional ergodic averages*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 50, 43–56 (1990).

[9] B.V. Gnedenko and A.N. Kolmogorov, *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Variables*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.,1954.

[10] J. Jacod and A.N. Shiryaev, *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*, 2nd. ed., Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 2003.

[11] Yu. Kifer and S.R.S. Varadhan, *Nonconventional limit theorems in discrete and continuous time via martingales*, Ann. Probab. 42(2014), 649–688.

[12] Yu. Kifer and S.R.S. Varadhan, *Nonconventional large deviations theorems*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 158 (2014), 197–224.

[13] S.I. Resnick, *Heavy-Tail Phenomena. Probabilistic and Statistical Modeling*, Springer, New York, 2007.

[14] E.L. Rvačeva, *On domains of attraction of multi-dimensional distributions*, in: Select. Transl. Math. Statist. and Probab., Vol. 2, AMS, Providence, RI 1962, p.p. 183-205.

[15] A.N. Shiryaev, *Probability*, Springer, New York, 1984.

[16] M. Tyran-Kamińska, *Convergence to Lévy stable processes under some weak dependence conditions*, Stoch. Proc. Appl. 120 (2010), 1629–1650.

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel
E-mail address: kifer@math.huji.ac.il

Courant Institute for Mathematical Studies, New York University, 251 Mercer St, New York, NY 10012, USA
E-mail address: varadhan@cims.nyu.edu